arXiv:1611.04422v2 [math.AP] 3 Jan 2017

Sharp Interface Limit for a Stokes/Allen-Cahn System

Helmut Abels and Yuning Liu

January 4, 2017

Abstract

We consider the sharp interface limit of a coupled Stokes/Allen-Cahn system, when a parameter $\varepsilon > 0$ that is proportional to the thickness of the diffuse interface tends to zero, in a two dimensional bounded domain. For sufficiently small times we prove convergence of the solutions of the Stokes/Allen-Cahn system to solutions of a sharp interface model, where the interface evolution is given by the mean curvature equation with an additional convection term coupled to a two-phase Stokes system with an additional contribution to the stress tensor, which describes the capillary stress. To this end we construct a suitable approximation of the solution of the Stokes/Allen-Cahn system, using three levels of the terms in the formally matched asymptotic calculations, and estimate the difference with the aid of a suitable refinement of a spectral estimate of the linearized Allen-Cahn operator. Moreover, a careful treatment of the coupling terms is needed.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000): Primary: 76T99; Secondary: 35Q30, 35Q35, 35R35, 76D05, 76D45

Key words: Two-phase flow, diffuse interface model, sharp interface limit, Allen-Cahn equation, Free boundary problems

Contents

1 Introduction, Main Result, and Overview **2**

2 Preliminaries **8**
2.1 Coordinates 8
2.2 Tangential Differential Operators 10
2.3 The Stretched Variable 10
2.4 A Result from ODE-Theory 11
2.5 Remainder Terms 11
2.6 Parabolic Equations on Evolving Hypersurfaces 14
2.7 Spectral Estimate 18

3 Approximation of the Stokes System **20**
3.1 The Leading Part of the Velocity 20
3.2 The Leading Error in the Velocity 25

4 Approximate Solution for the Allen-Cahn Part **28**
4.1 Inner Expansion 29
4.2 The Full Expansion 38

5 Estimates of Approximate and Exact Solutions **42**
5.1 Estimates of the Error in the Velocity and the Remainder in the Linearization of f' 42
5.2 Proof of Theorem 1.1 47

A Appendix **49**
A.1 Formally Matched Asymptotics for Stokes System 49
A.2 Proof of Lemma 3.4 57
A.3 Expansion of the Allen-Cahn Part 58

1 Introduction, Main Result, and Overview

Two-phase flows of macroscopically immiscible fluids play an important role in real world applications e.g. in chemistry and engineering sciences. They lead to many interesting fundamental questions concerning modeling, numerical simulations and their mathematical analysis. There are two basic model classes: The so-called sharp and diffuse interface models. In sharp interface models the interface separating two fluids is described as a lower dimensional surface. In numerical simulations and the mathematical analysis the interface is usually either parametrized explicitly or described with the aid of the level set or characteristic function of one fluid domain. This leads to fundamental problems, when the interface develops singularities e.g. due to droplet collision or pinch-off. In diffuse interface models (also called phase field models) a partial mixing of the two fluids on a small length scale proportional to a parameter $\varepsilon > 0$ is taken into account. To this end an order parameter, which will be denoted by c_ε, is introduced, which is close to one of two distinct values (e.g. ± 1) in the bulk phases of the fluids and which varies smoothly between these two values in an interfacial region, which has – at least heuristically/in sufficiently smooth situations – a thickness proportional to ε. A fundamental diffuse interface model for a two-phase flow of two macroscopically immiscible, viscous Newtonian fluids with same densities is given by the so-called *model H*, which yields the Navier-Stokes/Cahn-Hilliard system

$$\rho\partial_t \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon + \rho\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon - \operatorname{div}(2\nu(c_\varepsilon)D\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon) + \nabla p_\varepsilon = -\varepsilon \operatorname{div}(\nabla c_\varepsilon \otimes \nabla c_\varepsilon) \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0,T_1), \tag{1.1}$$

$$\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0,T_1), \tag{1.2}$$

$$\partial_t c_\varepsilon + \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla c_\varepsilon = m_\varepsilon \Delta \mu_\varepsilon \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0,T_1), \tag{1.3}$$

$$\mu_\varepsilon = -\varepsilon \Delta c_\varepsilon + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} f'(c_\varepsilon) \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0,T_1) \tag{1.4}$$

together with suitable boundary and initial conditions for a suitable double well potential f, e.g. $f(s) = \frac{1}{8}(s^2-1)^2$. Here $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon$ are the velocity and the pressure of the fluid mixture, μ_ε is a chemical potential and c_ε is related to the concentration difference of the fluids. Moreover, $D\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon + \nabla \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon^T)$, $\rho > 0$ is a constant, $\nu\colon \mathbb{R} \to (0,\infty)$ a suitable function describing the viscosity, $\nabla = \nabla_x$, $\operatorname{div} = \operatorname{div}_x$, $\Delta = \Delta_x$ are always taken with respect to $x \in \Omega$.

Nowadays there are many results on existence of smooth solutions for sharp interface models of two-phase flows of viscous incompressible fluids for short times and sufficiently smooth initial data and for large times and initial data close to a stable equilibrium, cf. e.g. [18, 29, 37, 8, 36]. Moreover, there are some results on existence of generalized/weak solutions, cf. [35, 34, 1, 2, 6, 27]. But in most cases a satisfactory theory on weak solutions is unknown. On the other hand diffuse interface models for two-phase flows, such as (1.1)-(1.4) and generalizations of it, were studied intensively during the last decade. There are many results on existence and uniqueness of weak and strong solutions as well as long time behavior, which are comparable to the known results for the classical incompressible Navier-Stokes system in two and three space dimensions and phase field models without fluid mechanics, cf. e.g. [41, 12, 3, 22, 23]. We also refer to [25, Section on "Weak Solutions and Diffuse Interface Models for Incompressible Two-phase Flows"]

Although there are many analytic results on sharp and diffuse interface models for two-phase flows in fluid mechanics, there are only few rigorous results on convergence of solutions of diffuse interface models to sharp interface models as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Most results so far are based on the method of formally matched asymptotic expansions, where the validity of certain power series expansions close to the interface is assumed, cf. [40, 32, 4] for the model (1.1)-(1.4). First results on convergence for large times to so-called varifold solutions of the sharp interface models were obtained in [6, Appendix] and [5] for the model H and a generalization of it for fluids of different densities. A disadvantage of these results is that the notion of varifold solutions, which

are comparable to measure-valued solutions, is rather weak and no convergence rates can be shown. We note that results on non-convergence for certain scalings of a mobility coefficient were obtain in [5] and [7] or [38, Chapter 5]. A sharp interface limes for a Navier-Stokes/phase field system to a Navier-Stokes/Stefan system was proved by Starovoitov and Hoffmann [26] on the level of weak solutions. But the technique relies rather specifically on structural properties of the systems.

A similar sharp interface limit also arises in the theory of liquid crystals [21]. In the low temperature regime, the Landau-De Gennes theory predicts the co-existence of an isotropic phase and a nematic phase. Rescaling the corresponding hydrodynamic system (also referred to as Beris-Edward system) near the isotropic-nematic interface will lead to a limit system that is nematic and is governed by the Ericksen-Leslie system on one side and purely isotropic on the other side. However, a rigorous justification remains open. We believe that insights from the following analysis might also be helpful to solve this problem and other more complicated sharp interface limits in fluid mechanics.

It is the purpose of this contribution to establish a first rigorous convergence result with convergence rates in strong norms for the sharp interface limit $\varepsilon \to 0$ in the case of a two-phase flow in fluid mechanics, which is comparable to results known for single phase field models like the Allen-Cahn, the Cahn-Hilliard, or the phase field model equation, cf. De Mottoni and Schatzman [17], Alikakos et al. [9], Caginalp and Chen [13], respectively.

More precisely, on a bounded domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ we consider the asymptotic limit $\varepsilon \to 0$ of the following system:

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\Delta \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon + \nabla p_\varepsilon &= -\varepsilon \operatorname{div}(\nabla c_\varepsilon \otimes \nabla c_\varepsilon) && \text{in } \Omega \times (0,T_1), && (1.5)\\
\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon &= 0 && \text{in } \Omega \times (0,T_1), && (1.6)\\
\partial_t c_\varepsilon + \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla c_\varepsilon &= \Delta c_\varepsilon - \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} f'(c_\varepsilon) && \text{in } \Omega \times (0,T_1), && (1.7)\\
\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon|_{\partial\Omega} = 0 \quad c_\varepsilon|_{\partial\Omega} &= -1 && \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0,T_1), && (1.8)\\
c_\varepsilon|_{t=0} &= c_{0,\varepsilon} && \text{in } \Omega && (1.9)
\end{aligned}
$$

for a suitable double well potential f and for suitable "well-prepared" initial data $c_{0,\varepsilon}$ specified below.

Let us note that every sufficiently smooth solution of (1.5)-(1.9) satisfies the *energy identity*

$$
E_\varepsilon(c_\varepsilon(t)) + \int_0^t \int_\Omega \left(|\nabla \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon|^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} |\mu_\varepsilon|^2 \right) \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}\tau = E_\varepsilon(c_{0,\varepsilon}) \tag{1.10}
$$

for all $t \in (0,T_1)$, where $\mu_\varepsilon = -\varepsilon \Delta c_\varepsilon + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} f'(c_\varepsilon)$ and

$$
E_\varepsilon(c_\varepsilon(t)) = \int_\Omega \varepsilon \frac{|\nabla c_\varepsilon(x,t)|^2}{2} \, \mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega \frac{f(c_\varepsilon(x,t))}{\varepsilon} \, \mathrm{d}x,
$$

which provides some limited control as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

The sharp interface limit of (1.5)-(1.9) is the system

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\Delta \mathbf{v} + \nabla p &= 0 && \text{in } \Omega^\pm(t), t \in [0,T_0], && (1.11)\\
\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} &= 0 && \text{in } \Omega^\pm(t), t \in [0,T_0], && (1.12)\\
[2D\mathbf{v} - p\mathbf{I}]\mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t} &= -\sigma H_{\Gamma_t} \mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t} && \text{on } \Gamma_t, t \in [0,T_0], && (1.13)\\
[\mathbf{v}] &= 0 && \text{on } \Gamma_t, t \in [0,T_0], && (1.14)\\
\mathbf{v}|_{\partial\Omega} &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0,T_0], && (1.15)\\
V_{\Gamma_t} - \mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t} \cdot \mathbf{v}|_{\Gamma_t} &= H_{\Gamma_t} && \text{on } \Gamma_t, t \in [0,T_0]. && (1.16)
\end{aligned}
$$

Here Ω is the disjoint union of $\Omega^+(t), \Omega^-(t)$, and Γ_t for every $t \in [0,T_0]$, $\Omega^\pm(t)$ are smooth domains, $\Gamma_t = \partial\Omega^+(t)$, $\mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t}$ is the interior normal of Γ_t with respect to $\Omega^+(t)$. Moreover,

$$
[u](p,t) = \lim_{h \to 0+} [u(p + \mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t}(p)h) - u(p - \mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t}(p)h)]
$$

is the jump of a function $u\colon \Omega \times [0,T_0] \to \mathbb{R}^2$ at Γ_t in direction of $\mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t}$, H_{Γ_t} and V_{Γ_t} are the curvature and the normal velocity of Γ_t, both with respect to $\mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t}$. Furthermore, $D\mathbf{v} = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla \mathbf{v} + (\nabla \mathbf{v})^T)$ and $\sigma = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \theta_0'(\rho)^2 \mathrm{d}\rho$, where θ_0 is the so-called optimal profile that is the unique solution of

$$-\theta_0''(\rho) + f'(\theta_0(\rho)) = 0 \qquad \text{for all } \rho \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{1.17}$$

$$\lim_{\rho \to \pm\infty} \theta_0(\rho) = \pm 1, \qquad \theta_0(0) = 0. \tag{1.18}$$

If the material derivative $\partial_t \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon + \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon$ is added to the right-hand side of (1.5) (i.e., the Navier-Stokes equations are considered), the system (1.5)-(1.9) was already suggested by Liu and Shen in [31] as an alternative approximation of a classical sharp interface model for a two-phase flow of viscous, incompressible, Newtonian fluids, which has advantages for numerical simulations since the Allen-Cahn equation is of second order and not of fourth order as the Cahn-Hilliard equation. On the other hand, for solutions of (1.5)-(1.9) the total mass $\int_\Omega c_\varepsilon(x,t)\mathrm{d}x$ is in general not preserved in time, in contrast to solutions of (1.1)-(1.4), which is a disadvantage if the model is used to approximate a two-phase flow without phase transitions. However, (1.5)-(1.9) can be considered as a simplified model for a two-phase flow with phase transitions. Such models can yield systems of Navier-Stokes/Allen-Cahn type, cf. e.g. Blesgen [11]. Finally, let us mention that in [31] a rigorous result on the sharp interface limes of (1.5)-(1.9) was announced, which was not published so far to the best of the author's knowledge.

The limit system (1.11)-(1.16) was also studied by Liu, Sato, and Tonegawa in [30] if the Stokes equation on the right-hand side is replaced by a modified Navier-Stokes equation for a shear thickening non-Newtonian fluid of power-law type. They constructed weak solutions for this system using a Galerkin approximation by a corresponding Navier-Stokes/Allen-Cahn system. In the proof they pass to the limit in the Galerkin approximation and pass to the limit $\varepsilon \to 0$ simultaneously. Although the authors do not perform a separate sharp interface limit in the latter non-Newtonian Navier-Stokes/Allen-Cahn system, the result is close to it. The analysis depends heavily on the fact that a shear thickening fluid is used. Moreover, uniqueness of the limit is unknown and no convergence rates are given. Finally, we note that in [43] Takasao and Tonegawa study existence and regularity of global in time solutions of the mean curvature flow with a given convection term. To this end an approximation with a convective Allen-Cahn equation is used as well.

Throughout the paper we assume that $(\mathbf{v}, p, \Gamma)$ is a smooth solution of the limit equation (1.11)-(1.16) for some $T_0 > 0$, where $(\Gamma_t)_{t\in[0,T_0]}$ is a family of smoothly evolving compact, non-self-intersecting, closed curves in Ω. More precisely, we assume that

$$\Gamma := \bigcup_{t\in[0,T_0]} \Gamma_t \times \{t\}$$

is a smooth two-dimensional submanifold of $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ (with boundary), and $\mathbf{v}|_{\Omega^\pm} \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega^\pm})^2$, $p|_{\Omega^\pm} \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega^\pm})$, where

$$\Omega^\pm = \bigcup_{t\in[0,T_0]} \Omega^\pm(t) \times \{t\}.$$

In particular, we assume that $\Gamma_t \subseteq \Omega$ for every $t \in [0,T_0]$, which excludes contact angle problems. Moreover, for $T_1 \geq T_0$ let $(\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon, c_\varepsilon)$ be the (classical) solution of (1.5)-(1.9) with smooth initial values $c_{0,\varepsilon}\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, which will be specified in the main result below. Existence of classical solutions can be shown by standard methods. We could work with less regular initial data, but for simplicity of the presentation we assume smoothness.

We note that existence of local strong solutions of (1.11)-(1.16) can e.g. be obtained by adapting the strategy in [8], where a coupled Navier-Stokes/Mullins-Sekerka system was treated. This was carried out by Moser in [33] in the case where the Stokes system (1.11)-(1.12) is replaced by the instationary Navier-Stokes system. By standard arguments from the regularity theory of parabolic equations and the Stokes system, one can prove that the solution is indeed smooth for smooth initial values.

As in [9] and [16] we assume in the following that $f\colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is smooth and satisfies the assumptions

$$f'(\pm 1) = 0, \quad f''(\pm 1) > 0, \quad f(s) = f(-s) > 0 \quad \text{for all } s \in (-1,1).$$

We note that f' in the present paper corresponds to f in [9, 15] and to $-f$ in [16]. Then there is a unique solution $\theta_0 \colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ of (1.17)-(1.18), which is monotone and will play a central role in the following. Moreover, for every $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$, there is some $C_m > 0$ such that

$$|\partial_\rho^m(\theta_0(\rho) \mp 1)| \le C_m e^{-\alpha|\rho|} \quad \text{for all } \rho \in \mathbb{R} \text{ with } \rho \gtrless 0, \tag{1.19}$$

where $\alpha = \min(\sqrt{f''(-1)}, \sqrt{f''(1)})$. In the case $0 < \alpha < \min(\sqrt{f''(-1)}, \sqrt{f''(1)})$ a detailed proof can be found in [38, Lemma 2.6.1]. One can choose e.g. $f(s) = \frac{1}{8}(1-s^2)^2$. Then $\theta_0(s) = \tanh(\frac{s}{2})$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha = 1$, cf. e.g. [14]. For simplicity we will assume that f is even. This implies that θ_0 is odd and θ_0' is even.

For the statement of our main result, we need tubular neighborhoods of Γ_t. For $\delta > 0$ and $t \in [0, T_0]$ we defined

$$\Gamma_t(\delta) := \{y \in \Omega : \operatorname{dist}(y, \Gamma_t) < \delta\}, \quad \Gamma(\delta) = \bigcup_{t \in [0,T_0]} \Gamma_t(\delta) \times \{t\}.$$

Moreover, we define the signed distance function

$$d_\Gamma(x,t) := \operatorname{sdist}(\Gamma_t, x) = \begin{cases} \operatorname{dist}(\Omega^-(t), x) & \text{if } x \notin \Omega^-(t) \\ -\operatorname{dist}(\Omega^+(t), x) & \text{if } x \in \Omega^-(t) \end{cases}$$

for all $x \in \Omega, t \in [0, T_0]$. Since Γ is smooth and compact, there is some $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, such that $d_\Gamma \colon \Gamma(3\delta) \to \mathbb{R}$ is smooth, cf. Section 2.1 below.

Our main result is:

THEOREM 1.1 *Let $N = 2$, $(\mathbf{v}, \Gamma)$ be a smooth solution of (1.11)-(1.16) for some $T_0 \in (0, \infty)$ and let*

$$c_{A,0}^0(x) = \zeta(d_{\Gamma_0}(x))\theta_0\left(\frac{d_{\Gamma_0}(x)}{\varepsilon}\right) + (1 - \zeta(d_{\Gamma_0}(x)))\left(\chi_{\Omega^+(0)}(x) - \chi_{\Omega^-(0)}(x)\right) \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega,$$

where $d_{\Gamma_0} = d_\Gamma|_{t=0}$ is the signed distance function to Γ_0 and $\zeta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$\zeta(s) = 1, \text{ if } |s| \le \delta;\ \zeta(s) = 0, \text{ if } |s| \ge 2\delta;\ 0 \le -s\zeta'(s) \le 4 \text{ if } \delta \le |s| \le 2\delta. \tag{1.20}$$

Moreover, let $c_{0,\varepsilon} \colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, $0 < \varepsilon \le 1$, be smooth such that

$$\|c_{0,\varepsilon} - c_{A,0}^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le C\varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}} \qquad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in (0,1]$$

and some $C > 0$, $\sup_{0<\varepsilon\le 1} \|c_{0,\varepsilon}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} < \infty$ and $(\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon, c_\varepsilon)$ be the corresponding solutions of (1.5)-(1.9). Then there are some $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1]$, $R > 0$, $T \in (0, T_0]$, and $c_A \colon \Omega \times [0,T_0] \to \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{v}_A \colon \Omega \times [0,T_0] \to \mathbb{R}^2$ (depending on ε) such that

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T} \|c_\varepsilon(t) - c_A(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla(c_\varepsilon - c_A)\|_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,T)\setminus\Gamma(\delta))} \le R\varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}} \tag{1.21a}$$

$$\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}(c_\varepsilon - c_A)\|_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,T)\cap\Gamma(2\delta))} + \varepsilon\|\partial_{\mathbf{n}}(c_\varepsilon - c_A)\|_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,T)\cap\Gamma(2\delta))} \le R\varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}} \tag{1.21b}$$

and for any $q \in [1,2)$

$$\|\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{v}_A\|_{L^2(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} \le C(q,R)\varepsilon^2 \tag{1.22}$$

hold true for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ and some $C(q,R) > 0$. Moreover,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} c_A = \pm 1 \qquad \text{uniformly on compact subsets of } \Omega^\pm.$$

and

$$\mathbf{v}_A = \mathbf{v} + O(\varepsilon) \qquad \text{in } L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,T)) \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

More precise information on c_A can be found in Section 4. In particular, the result implies

$$c_\varepsilon \to \pm 1 \qquad \text{in } L^2_{loc}(\Omega^\pm).$$

Here $N = 2$ is the basic convergence order (w.r.t. the $L^\infty(\Omega)$-norm). Although this order is fixed, we will write $N + \frac{1}{2}$, $N - \frac{1}{2}$ etc. instead of $\frac{5}{2}$, $\frac{3}{2}$ etc. since in this way the relations between the different orders become more transparent.

Remark 1.2 It is easy to show that the solutions $(\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon, c_\varepsilon)$ of (1.5)-(1.9) satisfy

$$|c_\varepsilon(x,t)| \leq \max(\sup_{0<\varepsilon\leq 1} \|c_{0,\varepsilon}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, 1) \qquad \text{for all } x \in \Omega, t \in [0,T_0]. \tag{1.23}$$

To this end one can e.g. argue by contradiction and apply the same arguments as in the proof of the weak maximum principle.

For the proof of the main result, we will follow the same basic strategy, which was already successfully used in [17] for the Allen-Cahn equation, in [9] for the Cahn-Hilliard equation, and in [16] for the mass-preserving Allen-Cahn equation. In many details we will follow the constructions in [16]. Following this strategy the proof consists of two parts. In the first part a suitable approximate solution, which will be denoted by $(\mathbf{v}_A, c_A)$ in the following, for (1.5)-(1.9) upto an error term of a certain order in ε is constructed. To this end finitely many terms of an expansion in $\varepsilon > 0$, using the method of formally matched asymptotics, are used. In the second step the error of the approximate $(\mathbf{v}_A, c_A)$ and the exact solutions $(\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon, c_\varepsilon)$ are estimated with the aid of a suitable estimate for the linearized Allen-Cahn operator $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon$, defined by

$$\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon u = -\Delta u + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} f''(c_A)u, \quad \text{for all } u \in H^2(\Omega). \tag{1.24}$$

However, in order to adapt this strategy to the present system, several new difficulties, which are mainly related to the coupling of the Allen-Cahn and the Stokes system, have to be overcome. More precisely, in order to estimate the difference $u := c_\varepsilon - c_A$, a suitable estimate of the convection term $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla c_\varepsilon$ is required. To this end it will be essential how this term is approximated in the equation of c_A. More precisely, we will construct c_A such that we have the following result:

THEOREM 1.3 *Let the assumption of Theorem 1.1 be satisfied and $R \geq 1$. Then for every $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ there are*

$$\mathbf{v}_A, \mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2 \colon \Omega \times [0,T_0] \to \mathbb{R}^2, \quad c_A \colon \Omega \times [0,T_0] \to \mathbb{R}, \quad r_A \colon \Omega \times [0,T_0] \to \mathbb{R}$$

(depending on $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$) such that $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{v}_A + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{w}_1 + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{w}_2$ and

$$\partial_t c_A + (\mathbf{v}_A + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{w}_2) \cdot \nabla c_A + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma \cdot \nabla c_A = \Delta c_A - \frac{f'(c_A)}{\varepsilon^2} + r_A \quad \text{in } \Omega \times [0,T_0] \tag{1.25}$$

as well as $c_A|_{\partial\Omega} = -1$, $\mathbf{v}_A|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$. Moreover, there are some $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $T_1 > 0$ and $M_R \colon (0,1] \times (0,T_0] \to (0,\infty)$, which is increasing with respect to both variables, such that $M_R(\varepsilon,T) \to_{(\varepsilon,T)\to 0} 0$ and, if

$$\sup_{0\leq t\leq T_\varepsilon} \|c_\varepsilon(t) - c_A(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla(c_\varepsilon - c_A)\|_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,T_\varepsilon)\setminus\Gamma(\delta))} \leq R\varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{1.26a}$$

$$\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}(c_\varepsilon - c_A)\|_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,T_\varepsilon)\cap\Gamma(2\delta))} + \varepsilon\|\partial_{\mathbf{n}}(c_\varepsilon - c_A)\|_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,T_\varepsilon)\cap\Gamma(2\delta))} \leq R\varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}} \tag{1.26b}$$

hold true for some $T_\varepsilon \in (0,T_0]$, $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1]$, and all $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0]$, then

$$\int_0^T \left| \int_\Omega r_A(x,t)(c_\varepsilon(x,t) - c_A(x,t)) \mathrm{d}x \right| \mathrm{d}t \leq M_R(\varepsilon,T)\varepsilon^{2(N+\frac{1}{2})}, \tag{1.27}$$

for all $T \in (0, \min(T_\varepsilon, T_1))$, $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0]$.

Here $\mathbf{w}_1$ will be the leading part of the error $\mathbf{w} = \frac{\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{v}_A}{\varepsilon^2}$ and $\mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma(x,t) = \mathbf{w}_1(P_{\Gamma_t}(x),t)$ for $x \in \Gamma_t(2\delta)$, where P_{Γ_t} denotes the orthogonal projection onto Γ_t, cf. Section 2.1 below. The tangential gradient $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}$ and $\partial_{\mathbf{n}}$ will be defined precisely in the same subsection. In (1.25) $\varepsilon^2 \mathbf{w}_2 \cdot \nabla c_A$ can also be omitted since it is of the same order as r_A. But the presence of the term $\varepsilon^2 \mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma \cdot \nabla c_A$ is essential for the error estimates, cf. Section 5 and Lemma 5.1 below for the details.

We will prove Theorem 1.1 with the aid of the latter theorem by considering the equation for $u = c_\varepsilon - c_A$ and using suitable estimates for $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon$, which refine the results of [15] in tangential

directions, as well as careful estimates of all remainder terms. In this proof a continuation argument is used to show that (1.26) is valid for $T_\varepsilon \geq T_1 > 0$ if T_1 is sufficiently small.

Remark: Let us comment on the orders of ε on the right-hand side of (1.26). Because of (1.19) and a simple change of variables, we have

$$\|\theta_0(\tfrac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}) - (\chi_{[0,\infty)} - \chi_{(-\infty,0)})\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = M\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Hence the power $\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ appears naturally, when estimating differences in L^2 in normal direction. Moreover, applying the one-dimensional interpolation inequality

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(-2\delta,2\delta)} \leq C_\delta \|u\|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{L^2(-2\delta,2\delta)} \|u\|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{H^1(-2\delta,2\delta)} \quad \text{for all } u \in H^1(-2\delta,2\delta),$$

to (1.26) yield a control of u of the order ε^N in the L^∞-norm in normal direction (and L^2-norms in the other directions).

As mentioned above the form of the convection terms in (1.25) will be essential for the remainder estimates. In order to obtain this we will construct c_A such that

$$c_A(x,t) = \underbrace{\theta_0\left(\frac{d_\Gamma(x,t)}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon(S(x,t),t)\right)}_{=c_{A,0}} + O(\varepsilon^2), \quad \text{where } h_\varepsilon = h_1 + \varepsilon h_{2,\varepsilon},$$

in $\Gamma(\delta)$ for some suitable $h_1, h_{2,\varepsilon} \colon \mathbb{T}^1 \times [0,T_0] \to \mathbb{R}$, cf. Section 4 for the details.. Here S is defined in Section 2.1 below. For every $t \in [0,T_0]$, $S(\cdot,t)|_{\Gamma_t} \colon \Gamma_t \to \mathbb{T}^1$ is the pull-back of a suitable parametrization of Γ_t. In order to include the term $\mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma \cdot \nabla c_A$ in (1.25), we will use a suitable choice of $h_{2,\varepsilon}$, which will depend on $\mathbf{w}_1$, cf. (4.9) below. Here $\mathbf{w}_1$ depends on ε and we have only certain norms of $\mathbf{w}_1$ under control as $\varepsilon \to 0$. This is in sharp contrast to the term h_1, which is defined by an equation independent of ε, cf. (4.3) below. The latter equation basically depends only on the (smooth) limit solution $(\Gamma, \mathbf{v}, p)$ as it is the case in the expansions in [17, 9, 16]. The careful treatment of $h_{2,\varepsilon}$ (as well as a similar higher order term $\hat{c}_{3,\varepsilon}$ in the expansion of c_A) is one of the essential novelties in this contribution compared to [17, 9, 16] and a key to the proof of our main result. Furthermore, treatment of the error $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{v}_A$ using careful estimates for (very) weak solutions of the Stokes system and the errors in the capillary term on the right-hand side of (1.5) are another essential ingredient. Finally let us note that another novelty of the present contribution in comparison to [17, 9, 16] is that, in the expansion of c_A we will only use three terms of orders $O(1)$, $O(\varepsilon^2)$ and $O(\varepsilon^3)$, respectively, which reduces the number of levels in the asymptotic expansion significantly.

The structure of this article is as follows. In Section 2 we will discuss several preliminary results concerning suitable coordinates close to Γ, evolution equations for $h_1, h_{2,\varepsilon}$, results on ODEs needed in the asymptotic expansions, and some kind of spectral estimate for $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon$ uniformly in $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0]$. Then $\mathbf{v}_A$ is constructed in Section 3 assuming that the leading part of $c_{A,0}$ of c_A (which depends on $h_1, h_{2,\varepsilon}$) is known. Moreover, $\mathbf{v}_A \cdot \nabla c_{A,0}$ is expanded and using the knowledge of the latter expansion, c_A is constructed in Section 4 and Theorem 1.3 is proved. Finally, the main result is proven in Section 5. Some lengthy but straight forward calculations related to the matched asymptotic expansions are given in details in the Appendix.

Acknowledgements: This work was supported by the SPP 1506 "Transport Processes at Fluidic Interfaces" of the German Science Foundation (DFG) through the grant AB285/4-2. Y. Liu was supported by Chenguang Plan 15CG66 of Shanghai Municipal Education Commission & Shanghai Educational Development Foundation. Both supports are gratefully acknowledged. Moreover, the authors are greatful to Dr. Daniel Lengeler for several fruitful discussions, which contributed to this work, and help with the proof of Theorem 2.13. Finally, we thank Andreas Schöttl and Maximilian Moser for their careful proofreading.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Coordinates

We will parametrize $(\Gamma_t)_{t\in[0,T_0]}$ with the aid of a family of smooth diffeomorphisms $X_0\colon \mathbb{T}^1 \times [0,T_0] \to \Omega$ such that $\partial_s X_0(s,t) \neq 0$ for all $s \in \mathbb{T}^1$, $t \in [0,T_0]$. Moreover, let

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}(s,t) = \frac{\partial_s X_0(s,t)}{|\partial_s X_0(s,t)|} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{n}(s,t) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\tau}(s,t) \qquad \text{for all } (s,t) \in \mathbb{T}^1 \times [0,T_0]$$

be the normalized tangent and normal vectors on Γ_t at $X_0(s,t)$.

We choose the orientation of Γ_t (induced by $X_0(\cdot,t)$) such that $\mathbf{n}(s,t)$ is the exterior normal with respect to $\Omega^-(t)$. Moreover, we denote

$$\mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t}(x) := \mathbf{n}(s,t) \text{ for all } x = X_0(s,t) \in \Gamma_t. \tag{2.1}$$

Furthermore, V_{Γ_t} and H_{Γ_t} should be the normal velocity and (mean) curvature of Γ_t (with respect to $\mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t}$) and we define

$$V(s,t) = V_{\Gamma_t}(X_0(s,t)), \quad H(s,t) = H_{\Gamma_t}(X_0(s,t)) \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathbb{T}^1, t \in [0,T_0]. \tag{2.2}$$

Hence $H_{\Gamma_t} \leq 0$ if $\Omega^-(t)$ is convex. Moreover, by definition,

$$V_{\Gamma_t}(X_0(s,t)) = V(s,t) = \partial_t X_0(s,t) \cdot \mathbf{n}(s,t) \qquad \text{for all } (s,t) \in \mathbb{T}^1 \times [0,T_0].$$

In the following we will need a tubular neighborhood of Γ_t: For $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, the orthogonal projection $P_{\Gamma_t}(x)$ of all

$$x \in \Gamma_t(3\delta) = \{y \in \Omega : \operatorname{dist}(y,\Gamma_t) < 3\delta\}$$

is well-defined and smooth. Moreover, we choose δ so small that $\operatorname{dist}(\partial\Omega,\Gamma_t) > 3\delta$ for every $t \in [0,T_0]$. Every $x \in \Gamma_t(3\delta)$ has a unique representation

$$x = P_{\Gamma_t}(x) + r\mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t}(P_{\Gamma_t}(x))$$

where $r = \operatorname{sdist}(\Gamma_t, x)$. Here

$$d_\Gamma(x,t) := \operatorname{sdist}(\Gamma_t,x) = \begin{cases} \operatorname{dist}(\Omega^-(t),x) & \text{if } x \notin \Omega^-(t), \\ -\operatorname{dist}(\Omega^+(t),x) & \text{if } x \in \Omega^-(t). \end{cases}$$

For the following we define for $\delta' \in (0,3\delta]$

$$\Gamma(\delta') = \bigcup_{t\in[0,T_0]} \Gamma_t(\delta') \times \{t\}.$$

Throughout this contribution we will often use

$$\int_{\Gamma_t(\delta')} f(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = \int_{-\delta'}^{\delta'} \int_{\Gamma_t} f(p + r\mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t}(p)) J(r,p,t) \mathrm{d}\sigma(p)\mathrm{d}r$$

for any $\delta' \in (0,3\delta]$, where $J\colon (-3\delta,3\delta) \times \Gamma \to (0,\infty)$ is a smooth function depending on Γ.

We introduce new coordinates in $\Gamma(3\delta)$ which we denote by

$$X\colon (-3\delta,3\delta) \times \mathbb{T}^1 \times [0,T_0] \mapsto \Gamma(3\delta) \text{ by } X(r,s,t) := X_0(s,t) + r\mathbf{n}(s,t),$$

where

$$r = \operatorname{sdist}(\Gamma_t,x), \qquad s = X_0^{-1}(P_{\Gamma_t}(x),t) =: S(x,t). \tag{2.3}$$

Differentiating the identity

$$d_\Gamma(X_0(s,t) + r\mathbf{n}(s,t),t) = r,$$

one obtains

$$\nabla d_\Gamma(x,t) = \mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t}(P_{\Gamma_t}(x)),\ \partial_t d_\Gamma(x,t) = -V_{\Gamma_t}(P_{\Gamma_t}(x)),\ \Delta d_\Gamma(q,t) = -H_{\Gamma_t}(q) \tag{2.4}$$

for all $(x,t) \in \Gamma(3\delta)$, $(q,t) \in \Gamma$, resp., cf. Chen et al. [16, Section 4.1]. Moreover, we define

$$\partial_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u(x,t) := \boldsymbol{\tau}(S(x,t),t)u(x,t), \quad \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u(x,t) := \partial_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u(x,t)\boldsymbol{\tau}(S(x,t),t) \tag{2.5}$$

for all $(x,t) \in \Gamma(3\delta)$.

In the following we associate a function $\phi(x,t)$ to $\tilde{\phi}(r,s,t)$ such that

$$\phi(x,t) = \tilde{\phi}(d_\Gamma(x,t), S(x,t), t) \quad \text{or} \quad \phi(X_0(s,t) + r\mathbf{n}(s,t), t) = \tilde{\phi}(r,s,t).$$

Then it follows from chain rule together with (2.4) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \phi(x,t) &= -V_{\Gamma_t}(P_{\Gamma_t}(x))\partial_r \tilde{\phi}(r,s,t) + \partial_t^\Gamma \tilde{\phi}(r,s,t) \\
\nabla \phi(x,t) &= \mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t}(P_{\Gamma_t}(x))\partial_r \tilde{\phi}(r,s,t) + \nabla^\Gamma \tilde{\phi}(r,s,t) \\
\Delta \phi(x,t) &= \partial_r^2 \tilde{\phi}(r,s,t) + \Delta d_{\Gamma_t}(x)\partial_r \tilde{\phi}(r,s,t) + \Delta^\Gamma \tilde{\phi}(r,s,t),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

where r, s are as in (2.3) and we used the notation

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t^\Gamma \tilde{\phi}(r,s,t) &= \partial_t \tilde{\phi}(r,s,t) + \partial_t S(x,t)\partial_s \tilde{\phi}(r,s,t), \\
\nabla^\Gamma \tilde{\phi}(r,s,t) &= (\nabla S)(x,t)\partial_s \tilde{\phi}(r,s,t), \\
\Delta^\Gamma \tilde{\phi}(r,s,t) &= |(\nabla S)(x,t)|^2 \partial_s^2 \tilde{\phi}(r,s,t) + (\Delta S)(x,t)\partial_s \tilde{\phi}(r,s,t),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

cf. [16, Section 4.1] for more details. In (2.7) x is understood via $x = \mathbf{n}(s,t)r + X_0(s,t)$. It can be seen from (2.7) that, if $g\colon \mathbb{T}^1 \times [0,T_0] \to \mathbb{R}$ depends only on (s,t), then $\nabla^\Gamma g$ will be a function of (r,s,t) instead of merely depending on the surface coordinate s and t:

$$\nabla^\Gamma g(r,s,t) = (\nabla S)(x,t)\partial_s g(s,t), \qquad \text{where } x = X(r,s,t). \tag{2.8}$$

We note that, since Γ is given and smooth, we have $|\nabla^\Gamma g| \le C|\partial_s g|$. Moreover, differentiating

$$s = S(X_0(x,t) + r\mathbf{n}(s,t), t) \qquad \text{for all } s \in \mathbb{T}^1, r \in (-3\delta, 3\delta)$$

with respect to r we obtain $\nabla S(x,t) \cdot \mathbf{n}(s,t) = 0$ for all $(x,t) \in \Gamma(3\delta)$, $s = S(x,t)$. Motivated by this, we define for every $h\colon \mathbb{T}^1 \times [0,T_0] \to \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned}
(\nabla_\Gamma h)(s,t) &:= (\nabla^\Gamma h)(0,s,t), \\
(\Delta_\Gamma h)(s,t) &:= (\Delta^\Gamma h)(0,s,t), \\
(D_t h)(s,t) &:= (\partial_t^\Gamma h)(0,s,t),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

which are the restrictions to $r = 0$ of the operators above, and we define the differences

$$\begin{aligned}
(L^\nabla h)(r,s,t) &:= (\nabla^\Gamma h)(r,s,t) - (\nabla_\Gamma h)(s,t), \\
(L^\Delta h)(r,s,t) &:= (\Delta^\Gamma h)(r,s,t) - (\Delta_\Gamma h)(s,t), \\
(L^t h)(r,s,t) &:= (\partial_t^\Gamma h)(r,s,t) - (D_t h)(s,t).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

So the coefficients of the latter operators vanish for $r = 0$, which corresponds to $x \in \Gamma_t$.

Throughout this contribution we will frequently use that, if $a\colon \Gamma(3\delta) \to \mathbb{R}$ is smooth in normal direction and vanishes on Γ, then $\tilde{a}\colon \Gamma(3\delta) \to \mathbb{R}$ with

$$\tilde{a}(x,t) = \begin{cases} \frac{a(x,t)}{d_\Gamma(x,t)} & \text{if } (x,t) \in \Gamma(3\delta) \setminus \Gamma, \\ \partial_{\mathbf{n}} a(x,t) & \text{if } (x,t) \in \Gamma \end{cases}$$

is smooth in normal direction as well. Moreover, regularity in tangential directions is preserved. In particular $\tilde{a}$ is smooth if a is smooth. These statements can be easily proved with the aid of a Taylor expansion with respect to d_Γ.

Finally, we denote

$$\begin{aligned}
(X_0^* u)(s,t) &:= u(X_0(s,t),t) \qquad \text{for all } s \in \mathbb{T}^1, t \in [0,T_0], \\
(X_0^{*,-1} v)(p,t) &:= v(X_0^{-1}(p,t),t) \qquad \text{for all } (p,t) \in \Gamma
\end{aligned}$$

if $u\colon \Gamma \to \mathbb{R}^N$ and $v\colon \mathbb{T}^1 \times [0,T_0] \to \mathbb{R}^N$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

2.2 Tangential Differential Operators

In view of (2.5), we can express the tangential derivative in the following way

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} = (I - \mathbf{n}(S(\cdot),\cdot) \otimes \mathbf{n}(S(\cdot),\cdot))\nabla. \tag{2.11}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}[\partial_{\mathbf{n}}, \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}]g &:= \partial_{\mathbf{n}}((I - \mathbf{n}\otimes\mathbf{n})\nabla g) - (I - \mathbf{n}\otimes\mathbf{n})\nabla(\partial_{\mathbf{n}} g)\\ &= (I - \mathbf{n}\otimes\mathbf{n})\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\nabla g - (I - \mathbf{n}\otimes\mathbf{n})\nabla(\mathbf{n}\cdot\nabla g)\\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{2}((I - \mathbf{n}\otimes\mathbf{n})\nabla \mathbf{n}_j)\partial_{x_j} g = \boldsymbol{\tau}(\partial_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\mathbf{n}\cdot\nabla g).\end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

This shows that the commutator $[\partial_{\mathbf{n}}, \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}]$ is a tangential differential operator. For the sake of integrating by parts for functions defined near the interface, we need the formula

$$\begin{aligned}&\operatorname{div}(I - \mathbf{n}(S(\cdot),\cdot)\otimes\mathbf{n}(S(\cdot),\cdot))\\ =& -\underbrace{\operatorname{div}(\mathbf{n}(S(\cdot),\cdot))}_{=:-\kappa}\mathbf{n}(S(\cdot),\cdot) - \mathbf{n}(S(\cdot))\cdot\nabla\mathbf{n}(S(\cdot),\cdot) = \kappa\mathbf{n}(S(\cdot),\cdot).\end{aligned}$$

This together with Gauß' Theorem implies the following lemma:

Lemma 2.1 *Let $t \in [0,T_0]$. For any $u \in H_0^1(\Gamma_t(2\delta))$, $\mathbf{v} \in H_0^1(\Gamma_t(2\delta))^2$ we have*

$$\int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} u \operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\mathbf{v}\mathrm{d}x = -\int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}u\cdot\mathbf{v}\mathrm{d}x - \int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)}\kappa\mathbf{n}\cdot\mathbf{v}u\mathrm{d}x \tag{2.13}$$

where $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}$ is defined by (2.11) *and $\kappa = -\operatorname{div}\mathbf{n}(S(\cdot),\cdot)$.*

2.3 The Stretched Variable

In the sequel, for given functions $h_1, h_2 \colon \mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T_0]\to\mathbb{R}$, we shall define the stretched variable ρ by

$$\rho(x,t) = \tfrac{d_\Gamma(x,t)}{\varepsilon} - h_1(S(x,t),t) - \varepsilon h_2(S(x,t),t). \tag{2.14}$$

Moreover, we denote $h_\varepsilon := h_1 + \varepsilon h_2$. As in [16, Section 4.2] we consider the Taylor expansion of Δd_Γ in the normal direction and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta d_\Gamma(x,t) = &-H_{\Gamma_t}(s) - \varepsilon(\rho + h_\varepsilon(s,t))\kappa_1(s,t)\\ &+ \varepsilon^2\kappa_2(s,t)(\rho + h_\varepsilon(s,t))^2 + \varepsilon^3\kappa_{3,\varepsilon}(\rho,s,t),\end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

where s is understood via (2.3) and

$$\kappa_1(s,t) = -\nabla d_\Gamma(X_0(s,t))\cdot\nabla\Delta d_\Gamma(X_0(s,t)) = H(s,t)^2,$$

$\kappa_2(s,t)$ is smooth and $\kappa_{3,\varepsilon}$ is a smooth function satisfying

$$|\kappa_{3,\varepsilon}(\rho,s,t)| \le C|\rho + h_\varepsilon(s,t)|^3 \qquad \text{for all } \rho\in\mathbb{R}, s\in\mathbb{T}^1, t\in[0,T_0], \varepsilon\in(0,1). \tag{2.16}$$

The following lemma is due to the chain rule and (2.6), cf. [16, Section 4.2]:

Lemma 2.2 *Let $\hat{w}\colon \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T_0]\to\mathbb{R}$ be sufficiently smooth and let*

$$w(x,t) = \hat{w}\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma(x,t)}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon(S(x,t),t), S(x,t), t\right) \quad \text{for all } (x,t)\in\Gamma(2\delta).$$

Then for each $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t w(x,t) =& -\left(\tfrac{V_{\Gamma_t}(P_{\Gamma_t}(x))}{\varepsilon} + \partial_t^\Gamma h_\varepsilon(r,s,t)\right)\partial_\rho\hat{w}(\rho,s,t) + \partial_t^\Gamma\hat{w}(r,\rho,s,t)\\ \nabla w(x,t) =& \left(\tfrac{\mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t}(P_{\Gamma_t}(x))}{\varepsilon} - \nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon(r,s,t)\right)\partial_\rho\hat{w}(\rho,s,t) + \nabla^\Gamma\hat{w}(r,\rho,s,t)\\ \Delta w(x,t) =& (\varepsilon^{-2} + |\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon(r,s,t)|^2)\partial_\rho^2\hat{w}(\rho,s,t)\\ &+ \left(\varepsilon^{-1}\Delta d_\Gamma(x,t) - \Delta^\Gamma h_\varepsilon(r,s,t)\right)\partial_\rho\hat{w}(\rho,s,t)\\ &- 2\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon(r,s,t)\cdot\nabla^\Gamma\partial_\rho\hat{w}(r,\rho,s,t) + \Delta^\Gamma\hat{w}(r,\rho,s,t),\end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

where ρ is as in (2.14) *and (r,s) is understood via* (2.3).

2.4 A Result from ODE-Theory

The following result on solvability of the linearized equation for the optimal profile θ_0 will be essential for the asymptotic expansion. The proof can be found in [16, Lemma 3].

Proposition 2.3 *Assume that $g\colon \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T_0]\to\mathbb{R}$ and $g^\pm\colon \mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T_0]\to\mathbb{R}$ are smooth and for some $i\in\mathbb{N}_0$, $a>0$ satisfying*

$$\sup_{(s,t)\in\mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T_0]}\left|\partial_\rho^k\partial_s^l\partial_t^m[g(\rho,s,t)-g^\pm(s,t)]\right|\le C_{k,l,m}(1+|\rho|)^i e^{-a|\rho|}\quad \text{for all } \rho\gtrless 0.$$

for all $k,l,m\in\mathbb{N}_0$ and some $C_{k,l,m}>0$. Then for given $(s,t)\in\mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T_0]$ the ODE

$$-\partial_\rho^2 u+f''(\theta_0)u=g(\cdot,s,t)\ \text{in}\ \mathbb{R},\quad u(0,s,t)=0$$

has a unique bounded solution $u(\cdot,s,t)$ if and only if

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\rho,s,t)\theta_0'(\rho)\mathrm{d}\rho=0. \tag{2.18}$$

If the solution exists for all $(s,t)\in\mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T_0]$, then for all $(k,l,m)\in\mathbb{N}^3$ there is some $C_{k,l,m}$ such that

$$\sup_{(s,t)\in\mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T_0]}\left|\partial_\rho^k\partial_s^l\partial_t^m\left(u(\rho,s,t)-\frac{g^\pm(s,t)}{f''(\pm1)}\right)\right|\le C_{k,l,m}(1+|\rho|)^i e^{-a|\rho|}\quad \text{for all } \rho\gtrless 0. \tag{2.19}$$

2.5 Remainder Terms

In the sequel we shall use for fixed $t\in[0,T_0]$ and $1\le p<\infty$

$$L^{p,\infty}(\Gamma_t(2\delta)):=\left\{f\colon\Gamma_t(2\delta)\to\mathbb{R}\ \text{measurable}\ :\|f\|_{L^{p,\infty}(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}<\infty\right\},\quad \text{where}$$
$$\|f\|_{L^{p,\infty}(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}:=\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^1}\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{|r|\le 2\delta}|f(X_0(s,t)+r\mathbf{n}(s,t))|^p\mathrm{d}s\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Moreover, the standard L^p-Sobolev space of order $m\in\mathbb{N}_0$ on an open set $U\subseteq\mathbb{R}^N$ will be denoted by $W_p^m(U)$ and $L^p(U)$ is the usual Lebesgue space with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Furthermore, $H^s(U)$ denotes the L^2-Sobolev space of order $s\in\mathbb{R}$ and $H_0^s(U)$ is the closure of $C_0^\infty(U)$ in $H^s(U)$. The X-valued variants are denoted by $W_p^m(U;X)$, $L^p(U;X)$, and $H^s(U;X)$, respectively. We note that

$$H^1(\Gamma_t(2\delta))\hookrightarrow L^{4,\infty}(\Gamma_t(2\delta)), \tag{2.20}$$

which follows from the interpolation inequality

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty(-2\delta,2\delta)}\le C\|f\|^{\frac12}_{L^2(-2\delta,2\delta)}\|f\|^{\frac12}_{H^1(-2\delta,2\delta)}\quad \text{for } f\in H^1(-2\delta,2\delta).$$

The following lemma provides a first useful general estimate of typical remainder terms.

Lemma 2.4 *Let $g\colon\mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T_0]\to\mathbb{R}$ be continuous. There is some $C>0$, independent of g, such that*

$$\left\|\eta(\tfrac{d_\Gamma(\cdot,t)}{\varepsilon}-g(S(\cdot,t),t))u\psi\right\|_{L^1(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\le C\varepsilon^{\frac12}\|\eta\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}\|u\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\|\psi\|_{L^{2,\infty}(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}$$

holds for any $u\in L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta)),\psi\in L^{2,\infty}(\Gamma_t(2\delta))$, continuous $\eta\in L^2(\mathbb{R})$, and $\varepsilon\in(0,1)$.

Proof: For fixed $t \in [0,T_0]$ we perform the change of variables $(x,t) \mapsto (s,r,t)$ and get

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \left|\eta(\tfrac{d_\Gamma(x,t)}{\varepsilon} - g(S(x,t),t))u(x)\psi(x)\right| \mathrm{d}x \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^1}\int_{-2\delta}^{2\delta} \left|\eta(\tfrac{r}{\varepsilon} - g(s,t))u(X(r,s,t))\psi(X(r,s,t))\right| J_t(r,s)\mathrm{d}r\mathrm{d}s.\end{aligned}$$

where $J_t(r,s)$ denotes the square root of the Gram determinant. Since $|J_t(r,s)| \le C$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\eta(\tfrac{d_\Gamma(\cdot,t)}{\varepsilon} - g(S(\cdot,t),t))u\psi\right\|_{L^1(\Gamma_t(2\delta))} \\ &\le C\int_{\mathbb{T}^1} \|\eta(\tfrac{\cdot}{\varepsilon} - g(s,t))\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \sup_{|r|\le 2\delta} |\psi(X(r,s,t))| \sqrt{\int_{|r|\le 2\delta} |u(X(r,s,t))|^2 J_t(r,s)\mathrm{d}r\mathrm{d}s} \\ &\le C\varepsilon^{\frac12}\|\eta\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{T}^1} \sup_{|r|\le 2\delta} |\psi(X(r,s,t))|^2 \mathrm{d}s} \sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{T}^1}\int_{|r|\le 2\delta} |u(X(r,s,t))|^2 J_t(r,s)\mathrm{d}r\mathrm{d}s},\end{aligned}$$

which implies the statement of the lemma. ∎

For a systematic treatment of the remainder terms, we introduce:

Definition 2.5 *For any $k \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha > 0$, $\mathcal{R}_{k,\alpha}$ denotes the vector space of all families of continuous functions $\hat r_\varepsilon \colon \mathbb{R}\times\Gamma(2\delta) \to \mathbb{R}$, $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, which are continuously differentiable with respect to $\mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t}$ for all $t \in [0,T_0]$ such that*

$$|\partial^j_{\mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t}} \hat r_\varepsilon(\rho,x,t)| \le Ce^{-\alpha|\rho|}\varepsilon^k \qquad \text{for all } \rho\in\mathbb{R}, (x,t)\in\Gamma(2\delta), j=0,1, \varepsilon\in(0,1) \tag{2.21}$$

for some $C>0$ independent of $\rho\in\mathbb{R}, (x,t)\in\Gamma(2\delta)$, $\varepsilon\in(0,1)$. Moreover, $\mathcal{R}_{k,\alpha}$ is equipped with the norm

$$\|(\hat r_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon\in(0,1)}\|_{\mathcal{R}_{k,\alpha}} = \sup_{\varepsilon\in(0,1),(x,t)\in\Gamma(2\delta),\rho\in\mathbb{R},j=0,1} |\partial^j_{\mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t}} \hat r_\varepsilon(\rho,x,t)| e^{\alpha|\rho|}\varepsilon^{-k}.$$

Finally, $\mathcal{R}^0_{k,\alpha}$ is the subspace of all $(\hat r_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon\in(0,1)} \in \mathcal{R}_{k,\alpha}$ such that

$$\hat r_\varepsilon(\rho,x,t) = 0 \qquad \text{for all } \rho\in\mathbb{R}, x\in\Gamma_t, t\in[0,T_0]. \tag{2.22}$$

Lemma 2.6 *Let $k\in\mathbb{R}$, $\alpha>0$, $1\le p\le\infty$, $h_\varepsilon\colon \mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T_0]\to\mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$M := \sup_{0<\varepsilon<\varepsilon_0,(s,t)\in\mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T_\varepsilon]} |h_\varepsilon(s,t)| < \infty$$

for some $T_\varepsilon\in(0,T_0]$, $\varepsilon_0\in(0,1)$, $(\hat r_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon\in(0,1)}\in\mathcal{R}_{k,\alpha}$ and

$$r_\varepsilon(x,t) := \hat r_\varepsilon\left(\frac{d_\Gamma(x,t)}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon(S(x,t),t),x,t\right) \qquad \text{for all } (x,t)\in\Gamma(2\delta).$$

Then there is a constant $C>0$, independent of $M, T_\varepsilon, 0<\varepsilon\le\varepsilon_0$, and $\varepsilon_0\in(0,1)$, such that

$$\|\sup_{(x,t)\in\Gamma(2\delta)} |\hat r_\varepsilon(\tfrac{\cdot}{\varepsilon},x,t)|\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})} \le C\varepsilon^{k+\frac1p} \qquad \text{for all } 0<\varepsilon<\varepsilon_0. \tag{2.23}$$

Moreover, if even $(\hat r_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon\in(0,1)}\in\mathcal{R}^0_{k,\alpha}$, then there is a constant $C>0$, independent of $M,T_\varepsilon, 0<\varepsilon\le\varepsilon_0$, and $\varepsilon_0\in(0,1)$, such that

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T_\varepsilon, s\in\mathbb{T}^1} \|r_\varepsilon(X(\cdot,s,t),t)\|_{L^p(-2\delta,2\delta)} \le C(M+1)\varepsilon^{k+\frac1p+1} \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0). \tag{2.24}$$

Proof: First let $(\hat{r}_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon\in(0,1)} \in \mathcal{R}_{k,\alpha}$ and $1 \le p < \infty$. Then

$$\| \sup_{(x,t)\in\Gamma(2\delta)} |\hat{r}_\varepsilon(\cdot,x,t)| \|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})}^p \le C\varepsilon^{kp} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha p|r|/\varepsilon} \mathrm{d}r = C\varepsilon^{kp+1} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha p|z|} \mathrm{d}z = C'\varepsilon^{kp+1}$$

uniformly in $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. This implies (2.23). If $p = \infty$, then (2.23) follows immediately from (2.21).

Now, if even $(\hat{r}_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon\in(0,1)} \in \mathcal{R}^0_{k,\alpha}$, then (2.22) implies

$$r_\varepsilon(X(r,s,t),t) = \int_0^r \partial_{\mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t}} \hat{r}_\varepsilon \left(\tfrac{r}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon(s,t), X(z,s,t), t\right) \mathrm{d}z \quad \text{for all } r \in (-2\delta, 2\delta).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} |r_\varepsilon(X(r,s,t),t)| &\le C\varepsilon^k |r| e^{-\alpha|r/\varepsilon - h_\varepsilon(s,t)|} \\ &\le C\varepsilon^{k+1} |r/\varepsilon - h_\varepsilon(s,t)| e^{-\alpha|r/\varepsilon - h_\varepsilon(s,t)|} + CM\varepsilon^{k+1} e^{-\alpha|r/\varepsilon - h_\varepsilon(s,t)|}. \end{aligned}$$

Using this estimate together with $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |z|^{jp} e^{-\alpha|z|p} \mathrm{d}z < \infty$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, one proves (2.24) in a similar way as before. ∎

Corollary 2.7 *Let r_ε, h_ε, M and $T_\varepsilon, 0 < \varepsilon \le \varepsilon_0$ be as in Lemma 2.6, $(\hat{r}_\varepsilon)_{0<\varepsilon<1} \in \mathcal{R}_{k,\alpha}$ for some $\alpha > 0$, $k \in \mathbb{R}$ and let $j = 1$ if even $(\hat{r}_\varepsilon)_{0<\varepsilon<1} \in \mathcal{R}^0_{k,\alpha}$ and $j = 0$ else. Then there is some $C > 0$, independent of $T_\varepsilon, 0 < \varepsilon \le \varepsilon_0$, $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1)$ such that*

$$\|a(P_{\Gamma_t}(\cdot)) r_\varepsilon \varphi\|_{L^1(\Gamma_t(2\delta))} \le C(1+M)^j \varepsilon^{1+k+j} \|\varphi\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|a\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t)},$$

$$\|a(P_{\Gamma_t}(\cdot)) r_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))} \le C(1+M)^j \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}+k+j} \|a\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t)}$$

uniformly for all $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega)$, $a \in L^2(\Gamma_t)$, $t \in [0, T_\varepsilon]$, and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$.

Proof: Using a change of variables $(x,t) \mapsto (r,s,t)$ and then Lemma 2.6, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\|a(P_{\Gamma_t}(\cdot)) r_\varepsilon \varphi\|_{L^1(\Gamma_t(2\delta))} \\ &= \int_{-2\delta}^{2\delta} \int_{\mathbb{T}^1} |a(X_0(s,t))| \left|\hat{r}_\varepsilon \left(\tfrac{r}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon(s,t), X(r,s,t), t\right)\right| |\varphi(X(r,s,t))| J_t(r,s) \mathrm{d}s\mathrm{d}r \\ &\le C \int_{\mathbb{T}^1} |a(X_0(s,t))| \left\| \sup_{(x,t)\in\Gamma(2\delta)} |\hat{r}_\varepsilon(\tfrac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}, x, t)| \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \sup_{r\in(-2\delta,2\delta)} |\varphi(X(r,s,t))| \mathrm{d}s \\ &\le C(1+M)^j \varepsilon^{1+j+k} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^1} \sup_{|r|\le 2\delta} |\varphi(X(r,s,t))|^2 \mathrm{d}s \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|a\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t)} \\ &\le C(1+M)^j \varepsilon^{1+j+k} \|\varphi\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|a\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t)} \end{aligned}$$

for all $a \in L^2(\Gamma_t)$, $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$, $t \in [0, T_\varepsilon]$, and $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega)$, which proves the first estimate.

Similarly, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|a(P_{\Gamma_t}(\cdot)) r_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))} &= \left(\int_{-2\delta}^{2\delta} \int_{\mathbb{T}^1} |a(X_0(s,t))|^2 \, |r_\varepsilon(X(r,s,t),t))|^2 \, J_t(r,s) \mathrm{d}s\mathrm{d}r \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\le C \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^1} \sup_{0\le t\le T_\varepsilon, s\in\mathbb{T}^1} \|r_\varepsilon(X(\cdot,s,t))\|^2_{L^2(-2\delta,2\delta)} \, |a(X_0(s,t))|^2 \mathrm{d}s \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\le C(1+M)^j \varepsilon^{1/2+j+k} \|a\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t)} \end{aligned}$$

for all $a \in L^2(\Gamma_t)$, $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, and $t \in [0, T_\varepsilon]$. ∎

Remark 2.8 In the following we will apply the results of this subsection to remainder terms $(\hat{r}_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0)}$ for some $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1]$. This case can easily be reduced to the former case by considering $(\check{r}_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon\in(0,1)}$ with

$$\check{r}_\varepsilon = \begin{cases} \hat{r}_\varepsilon & \text{if } \varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0), \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

In this way we can apply all definitions and statements above with $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0)$ instead of $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$.

2.6 Parabolic Equations on Evolving Hypersurfaces

Throughout this subsection $0 < T < \infty$ is arbitrary, but fixed. In later applications we will choose $T = T_0$. We shall denote the function space

$$X_T := L^2(0,T;H^{5/2}(\mathbb{T}^1)) \cap H^1(0,T;H^{1/2}(\mathbb{T}^1)), \tag{2.25}$$

equipped with the norm

$$\|u\|_{X_T} = \|u\|_{L^2(0,T;H^{5/2}(\mathbb{T}^1))} + \|u\|_{H^1(0,T;H^{1/2}(\mathbb{T}^1))} + \|u|_{t=0}\|_{H^{3/2}(\mathbb{T}^1)}.$$

We note that

$$X_T \hookrightarrow BUC([0,T];H^{3/2}(\mathbb{T}^1)) \cap L^4(0,T;H^2(\mathbb{T}^1)) \tag{2.26}$$

and the operator norm of the embedding is uniformly bounded in T. Likewise, we define

$$Y_T := L^2(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times(0,T)), \tag{2.27}$$

THEOREM 2.9 *Let $w\colon \mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T]\to\mathbb{R}^2$ and $a\colon \mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T]\to\mathbb{R}$ be smooth. For every $g\in L^2(0,T;H^{\frac12}(\mathbb{T}^1))$ and $h_0\in H^{\frac32}(\mathbb{T}^1)$ there is a unique solution $h\in X_T$ of*

$$D_t h + w\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h - \Delta_\Gamma h + ah = g \qquad \text{on } \mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T], \tag{2.28}$$

$$h|_{t=0} = h_0 \qquad \text{on } \mathbb{T}^1. \tag{2.29}$$

Proof: According to (2.9), equation (2.28) is equivalent to

$$\partial_t h - \mathcal{L}h = g \qquad \text{on } \mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T]$$

for some uniformly elliptic operator $\mathcal{L}$ on $\mathbb{T}^1$ with smooth coefficients depending on $(s,t)\in\mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T]$. More precisely for every fixed $t\in[0,T]$ the operator is $\Lambda(\theta)$-elliptic in the sense of [20, Definition 3.3] for every $0<\theta<\pi$.

Now the result follows from known results for parabolic equations. E.g. one can argue as follows: Let $\mathcal{L}(t_0)$, with $t_0\in[0,T]$, denote the same operator, where t in the coefficients is replaced by a fixed $t_0\in[0,T]$. Moreover, let

$$\mathcal{A}(t_0)\colon \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}(t_0)) := H^{\frac52}(\mathbb{T}^1) \subseteq H^{\frac12}(\mathbb{T}^1) \to H^{\frac12}(\mathbb{T}^1)$$

be its realization on $H^{\frac12}(\mathbb{T}^1)$. Then there is some $\lambda_0\geq 0$ such that $\lambda_0+\mathcal{A}(t_0)$ possesses a bounded H^∞-calculus due to [20, Theorem 4.10]. This implies that for every $\mathcal{A}(t_0)$ has maximal L^p-regularity on every finite time interval and for every $1<p<\infty$ due to [19, Theorem 3.2]. Now the theorem follows from [10, Theorem 2.7]. ∎

In order to couple (2.28) to the two-phase Stokes system, we need

Lemma 2.10 *For every $t\in[0,T]$, $\mathbf{a}\in H^{\frac12}(\Gamma_t)^2$ and $\mathbf{f}\in L^2(\Omega)^2$ there is a unique solution $(\mathbf{v},p)\in H^1_0(\Omega)^2\times L^2(\Omega)$ with $\mathbf{v}|_{\Omega^\pm(t)}\in H^2(\Omega^\pm(t))^2$, $p|_{\Omega^\pm(t)}\in H^1(\Omega^\pm(t))$, with $\int_\Omega p\,\mathrm{d}x = 0$ of*

$$-\Delta\mathbf{v} + \nabla p = \mathbf{f} \qquad \text{in } \Omega^\pm(t), \tag{2.30}$$

$$\operatorname{div}\mathbf{v} = 0 \qquad \text{in } \Omega^\pm(t), \tag{2.31}$$

$$[2D\mathbf{v} - p\mathbf{I}]\mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t} = \mathbf{a} \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_t. \tag{2.32}$$

Moreover, there is a constant $C > 0$ independent of $t \in [0,T]$ such that

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \sum_{\pm} \left(\|\mathbf{v}\|_{H^2(\Omega^\pm(t))} + \|p\|_{H^1(\Omega^\pm(t))} \right) \leq C \left(\|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{a}\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma_t)} \right). \tag{2.33}$$

Proof: First of all, [39, Theorem 1.1] implies the existence of a unique solution $(\mathbf{v}, p)$ and (2.33) for some $C > 0$, which might depend on $t \in [0,T]$. Hence it only remains to prove that $C > 0$ can be chosen independently of $t \in [0,T]$. Standard perturbation arguments imply that for every $t_0 \in [0,T]$ there is some $\varepsilon > 0$ such that (2.33) holds true for some $C > 0$ and any $t \in [0,T] \cap (t_0 - \varepsilon, t_0 + \varepsilon)$. (Alternatively, one can verify that the constants and cut-off functions in the proof of [39, Theorem 1.1] can be chosen independently of $t \in [0,T] \cap (t_0 - \varepsilon, t_0 + \varepsilon)$ if $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small.) Since $[0,T]$ is compact, there is some $C > 0$ such that (2.33) holds true for any $t \in [0,T]$. ∎

Corollary 2.11 *Let $w \colon \mathbb{T}^1 \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}^2$, $a \colon \mathbb{T}^1 \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$ and $b \colon \Gamma \to \mathbb{R}^2$ be smooth. For every $g \in L^2(0,T; H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^1))$ and $h_0 \in H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^1)$ there is a unique solution $h \in X_T$ of*

$$D_t h + w \cdot \nabla_\Gamma h - \Delta_\Gamma h + ah = X_0^*(\mathbf{v_n}) + g \qquad \text{on } \mathbb{T}^1 \times [0,T], \tag{2.34}$$

$$h|_{t=0} = h_0 \qquad \text{on } \mathbb{T}^1, \tag{2.35}$$

where for every $t \in [0,T]$, $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}(\cdot,t) \in H_0^1(\Omega)^2$ with $\mathbf{v}|_{\Omega^\pm(t)} \in H^2(\Omega^\pm(t))^2$ and $p = p(\cdot,t) \in H^1(\Omega \setminus \Gamma_t) \cap L^2(\Omega)$ with $\int_\Omega p \mathrm{d}x = 0$ are determined by

$$-\Delta \mathbf{v} + \nabla p = 0 \qquad \text{in } \Omega^\pm(t), t \in [0,T], \tag{2.36}$$

$$\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} = 0 \qquad \text{in } \Omega^\pm(t), t \in [0,T], \tag{2.37}$$

$$[2D\mathbf{v} - p\mathbf{I}]\mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t} = bX_0^{*,-1}(h) - \sigma X_0^{*,-1}(\Delta_\Gamma h)\mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t} \text{ on } \Gamma_t, t \in [0,T]. \tag{2.38}$$

Here $\sigma = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \theta_0'(\rho)^2 \mathrm{d}\rho$ as before and $\mathbf{v_n} = \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{v}$. Moreover, if g and h_0 are smooth, then h is smooth and $\mathbf{v}|_{\Omega^\pm}, p|_{\Omega^\pm}$ are smooth in $\overline{\Omega^\pm}$.

Proof: For given $h \in H^{\frac{5}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^1)$ and fixed $t \in [0,T]$, let $\mathbf{v} \in H^2(\Omega \setminus \Gamma_t)^2 \cap H_0^1(\Omega)^2$, $p \in H^1(\Omega \setminus \Gamma_t) \cap L^2(\Omega)$ with $\int_\Omega p \, dx = 0$ be determined as solution of (2.36)-(2.38). Then testing (2.36) by $\mathbf{v}$, integration by parts, and using (2.38) yields

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C \|(h, \Delta_\Gamma h)\|_{H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^1)} \leq C' \|h\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^1)}$$

for some C, C' independent of h and $t \in [0,T]$.

Now we define $\mathcal{B}(t) \colon H^{\frac{5}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^1) \to H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^1)$ by $\mathcal{B}(t)h := X_0^*(\mathbf{v_n})$. Then the previous estimate implies

$$\|\mathcal{B}(t)h\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^1)} \leq C \|h\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^1)}$$

for some C independent of h and $t \in [0,T]$. Hence we can extend $\mathcal{B}(t)$ to $\mathcal{B}(t) \colon H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^1) \to H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^1)$ by continuity. Moreover, $H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^1)$ is relatively closer to $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^1)$ compared with $H^{\frac{5}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^1)$ in the sense of [10] because of the compactness of the embedding $H^{\frac{5}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^1) \hookrightarrow H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^1)$, cf. [10, Example 2.9. (d)]. Hence the existence of a unique solution $h \in X_T$ as in the statement of the corollary follows from [10, Theorem 2.11] and the previous theorem.

Finally, smoothness of h and $\mathbf{v}|_{\Omega^\pm}$ in $\overline{\Omega^\pm}$ can be shown by standard localization techniques. To this end one transforms $\Omega^\pm$ and Γ locally (in space and time) to the situation of a flat interface and applies e.g. difference quotients in tangential directions or the time direction using the a priori estimates in L^2-Sobolev spaces obtained before. This yields one order of higher regularity of h, $\mathbf{v}|_{\Omega^\pm}$ and $p|_{\Omega^\pm}$ in tangential and time directions. Then one order higher regularity in normal directions follows from (2.36) and (2.37). Repeating this arguments yields the claimed smoothness. ∎

THEOREM 2.12 *Let $g\colon \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times(0,T)\to\mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function with $g(\cdot,s,t)\in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\rho,s,t)\theta_0'(\rho)\mathrm{d}\rho = 0 \qquad \text{for all } (s,t)\in\mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T]. \tag{2.39}$$

Then there is a unique smooth solution $c=c(\rho,s,t)$ solving

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^2(D_t c-\Delta_\Gamma c)-\partial_\rho^2 c+f''(\theta_0)c = g \quad &\text{on } \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T],\\ c|_{t=0}=0 \quad &\text{on } \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1. \end{aligned} \tag{2.40}$$

Moreover,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} c(\rho,s,t)\theta_0'(\rho)\mathrm{d}\rho = 0 \qquad \text{for all } (s,t)\in\mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T] \tag{2.41}$$

and there is a constant C independent of g,c, $T'\in(0,T]$ and $\varepsilon\in(0,1]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon\|c\|_{L^\infty(0,T';L^2(\mathbb{T}^1\times\mathbb{R}))}+\|(c,\partial_\rho c,\varepsilon\partial_s c)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times(0,T'))} &\le C\|g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times(0,T'))},\\ \varepsilon\|\partial_\rho c\|_{L^\infty(0,T';L^2(\mathbb{T}^1\times\mathbb{R}))}+\|\partial_\rho^2 c\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times(0,T'))} &\le C\|(g,\partial_\rho g)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times(0,T'))},\\ \varepsilon\|\partial_s c\|_{L^\infty(0,T';L^2(\mathbb{T}^1\times\mathbb{R}))}+\|(\partial_s c,\partial_s\partial_\rho c,\varepsilon\partial_s^2 c)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times(0,T'))} &\le C\|\partial_s g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times(0,T'))}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.42}$$

Furthermore, if additionally $\|(1+|\rho|)^k g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times(0,T'))}$ is finite for some $k\in\mathbb{N}$, then there is some C_k independent of c,g,ε,T' such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\varepsilon\|\rho^k c\|_{L^\infty(0,T';L^2(\mathbb{T}^1\times\mathbb{R}))}\\ &+\|(\rho^k c,\partial_\rho(\rho^k c),\varepsilon\rho^k\partial_s c)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times(0,T'))}\le C_k\|(1+|\rho|)^k g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times(0,T'))}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.43}$$

Finally, for any $1<p\le\infty$ there is a constant C_p independent of g,c, $T'\in(0,T]$ and $\varepsilon\in(0,1]$ such that

$$\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p}}\sup_{(s,t)\in\mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T']}\|c(\cdot,s,t)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}\le C_p\|\sup_{s\in\mathbb{T}^1}\|g(\cdot,s,t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}\|_{L^{2p}(0,T')}. \tag{2.44}$$

Proof: The proof of existence is similar to the proof of Theorem 2.9. If we denote

$$\mathcal{L}\phi := -\partial_\rho^2\phi+f''(\theta_0(\rho))\phi \quad \text{for all } \phi=\phi(\rho)\in H^2(\mathbb{R}),$$

then equation (2.40) is equivalent to

$$\varepsilon^2(\partial_t-\mathcal{A})c+\mathcal{L}c = g \qquad \text{on } \mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T] \tag{2.45}$$

for some uniformly elliptic operator $\mathcal{A}$ on $\mathbb{T}^1$ with smooth coefficients depending on $(s,t)\in\mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T]$. Then $\mathcal{L}$ is a non-negative self-adjoint operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ with $\ker\mathcal{L}=\operatorname{span}\{\theta_0'\}$, which is invertible on the orthogonal complement of $\operatorname{span}\{\theta_0'\}$, cf. e.g. [17, (1.8)]. By [20, Theorem 3.11 and Theorem 4.10] for every $\theta\in(0,\pi)$ there are some $\lambda_0,\lambda_1\ge 0$ such that $\lambda_0+\mathcal{A}(t_0)$ and $\lambda_1+\mathcal{L}$ possess a bounded H^∞-calculus on $L^2(\mathbb{T}^1)$, $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, respectively, and a sector $\mathbb{C}\setminus\Lambda(\theta)$, where $\Lambda(\theta)=\{z\in\mathbb{C}:\arg(z)\in[\theta,2\pi-\theta]\}$. The same is true if $L^2(\mathbb{T}^1)$ and $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ are replaced $L^2(\mathbb{T}^1\times\mathbb{R})$ since $\mathcal{A}(t_0)$ does not act on $\rho\in\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{L}$ does not act on $s\in\mathbb{T}^1$. Hence [28, Theorem 6.3] implies that $\lambda_0+\lambda_1+\mathcal{A}(t_0)+\mathcal{L}$ is $\mathcal{R}$-sectorial on $\Lambda(2\theta)$ for every $t_0\in[0,T]$. By choosing $\theta<\frac{\pi}{4}$, we obtain that $\mathcal{A}(t_0)+\mathcal{L}$ has maximal L^p-regularity on every finite time interval and for every $1<p<\infty$ due to [19, Theorem 3.2]. Now the existence of a unique solution

$$c\in H^1(0,T;L^2(\mathbb{T}^1\times\mathbb{R}))\cap L^2(0,T;H^2(\mathbb{T}^1\times\mathbb{R}))$$

follows again from [10, Theorem 2.7]. Furthermore, standard results on parabolic equations imply smoothness.

In order to prove (2.41), we multiply the equation (2.45) with $\theta_0'(\rho)$, use (2.39), and the fact that $\mathcal{L}$ is self-adjoint. This yields

$$\varepsilon^2(\partial_t - \mathcal{A})\int_{\mathbb{R}} c(\rho,s,t)\theta_0'(\rho)\mathrm{d}\rho = 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T],$$
$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} c(\rho,s,t)\theta_0'(\rho)\mathrm{d}\rho\Big|_{t=0} = 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{T}^1.$$

Hence, (2.41) follows from the unique solvability of the latter system. Consequently, we also obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} c(\rho,s,t)(\mathcal{L}c)(\rho,s,t)\mathrm{d}\rho \geq C\|c(\cdot,s,t)\|^2_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \tag{2.46}$$

since $\mathcal{L}$ is positive on the orthogonal complement of $\operatorname{span}\{\theta_0'\}$. Now the proof of (2.42) follows in a straight forward manner by testing the equation with c, differentiating with respect to ρ, s and testing with $\partial_\rho c$, $\partial_s c$, respectively, and integration by parts. The details are omitted here. Moreover, in order to prove (2.43) one uses that

$$\varepsilon^2(D_t - \Delta_\Gamma)(\rho^k c) - \partial_\rho^2(\rho^k c) + f''(\theta_0)\rho^k c = -2k\rho^{k-1}\partial_\rho c - k(k-1)\rho^{k-2}c + \rho^k g.$$

Now testing with $\rho^k c$ and using the interpolation inequalities

$$\|\rho^{k-1}\partial_\rho c\|_{L^2} \leq \|\rho^k\partial_\rho c\|_{L^2}^{\frac{k-1}{k}}\|\partial_\rho c\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{k}}, \qquad \|\rho^{k-2}c\|_{L^2} \leq \|\rho^k c\|_{L^2}^{\frac{k-2}{k}}\|c\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2}{k}},$$

Young's inequality, and (2.42) one derives (2.43) in the same way as before.

Finally, we prove (2.44). We multiply the differential equation for c in (2.40) with $\mathcal{L}c$, integrate with respect to ρ, and obtain

$$\varepsilon^2(\partial_t - \mathcal{A})\int_{\mathbb{R}} c(\rho,s,t)(\mathcal{L}c)(\rho,s,t)\mathrm{d}\rho + \int_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathcal{L}c)^2(\rho,s,t)\mathrm{d}\rho = \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\rho,s,t)(\mathcal{L}c)(\rho,s,t)\mathrm{d}\rho$$
$$\leq \|g(\cdot,s,t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}\|\mathcal{L}c(\cdot,s,t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}.$$

Using the fact that

$$\|(\mathcal{L}c)(\cdot,s,t)\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \geq 2\kappa\|(\mathcal{L}^{\frac{1}{2}}c)(\cdot,s,t)\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = 2\kappa\int_{\mathbb{R}} c(\cdot,s,t)(\mathcal{L}c)(\cdot,s,t)\mathrm{d}\rho$$

for some $\kappa > 0$ (since $c(\cdot,s,t)$ is orthogonal to θ_0') and Young's inequality we deduce that

$$\varepsilon^2(\partial_t - \mathcal{A} + \frac{\kappa}{\varepsilon^2})\int_{\mathbb{R}} c(\rho,s,t)(\mathcal{L}c)(\rho,s,t)\mathrm{d}\rho \leq \sup_{s\in\mathbb{T}^1}\|g(\cdot,s,t)\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} =: M(t).$$

Since the function $w(t) := \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\int_0^t e^{-\frac{\kappa}{\varepsilon^2}(t-s)}M(s)\mathrm{d}s$ satisfies $\varepsilon^2(w' + \frac{\kappa}{\varepsilon^2}w) = M$, it solves the equation

$$\varepsilon^2(\partial_t - \mathcal{A} + \tfrac{\kappa}{\varepsilon^2})w = M \quad \text{on } \mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T_0],$$
$$w|_{t=0} = 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{T}^1.$$

Thus, by the comparison principle and Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} c(\rho,s,t)(\mathcal{L}c)(\rho,s,t)\mathrm{d}\rho \leq w(t) \leq C_p\frac{\|M\|_{L^p(0,T')}}{\varepsilon^{2/p}} \quad \text{for all } t\in[0,T'],$$

which combined with (2.46) implies (2.44). ∎

2.7 Spectral Estimate

In this subsection we assume that $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a bounded domain and $\Gamma_t \subseteq \Omega$, $t \in [0,T_0]$, $T_0 > 0$, are given smoothly evolving closed and compact C^∞-hypersurfaces, dividing Ω in disjoint domains $\Omega^+(t)$ and $\Omega^-(t)$ as before, and

$$\begin{aligned} c_A(x) &= c_{A,0}(x) + \varepsilon^2 c_{A,2+}(x), && \text{for all } x \in \Omega, \\ c_{A,0}(x) &= \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \theta_0(\rho) + (1 - \zeta \circ d_\Gamma)\left(\chi_{\Omega^+(t)} - \chi_{\Omega^-(t)}\right) && \text{for all } x \in \Omega \end{aligned}$$

where ζ satisfies (1.20). Moreover, we assume that $\operatorname{dist}(\Gamma_t, \partial\Omega) > 2\delta$ for all $t \in [0,T_0]$. In this subsection, for given continuous functions $(\tilde{h}_\varepsilon)_{0<\varepsilon<1} \colon \Gamma \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\Gamma := \bigcup_{t\in[0,T_0]} \Gamma_t \times \{t\}$, we define the stretched variable ρ by

$$\rho = \frac{d_\Gamma(x,t)}{\varepsilon} - \tilde{h}_\varepsilon(P_{\Gamma_t}(x),t).$$

Finally, we assume that

$$\sup_{\varepsilon\in(0,1)} \left(\sup_{(p,t)\in\Gamma} |\tilde{h}_\varepsilon(p,t)| + \sup_{x\in\Omega, t\in[0,T_0]} |c_{A,2+}(x,t)| \right) \leq M \tag{2.47}$$

for some $M > 0$. We remark that later we will apply the results of this subsection to $\tilde{h}_\varepsilon(p,t) = h_\varepsilon(X_0^{-1}(p,t),t)$ for some $h_\varepsilon \colon \mathbb{T}^1 \times [0,T_0] \to \mathbb{R}$. But for the following proof the present formulation is more convenient. Moreover, the result holds true in any dimension $d \geq 2$.

The following spectral estimate will be a key ingredient for the proof of convergence.

THEOREM 2.13 *Let c_A be as above and (2.47) be satisfied for some $M > 0$. Then there are some $C, \varepsilon_0 > 0$, independent of $\tilde{h}_\varepsilon, c_A$, such that for every $\psi \in H^1(\Omega)$, $t \in [0,T_0]$, and $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0]$ we have*

$$\int_\Omega \left(|\nabla\psi(x)|^2 + \varepsilon^{-2} f''(c_A(x,t))\psi^2(x) \right) \mathrm{d}x \geq -C \int_\Omega \psi^2 \mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Omega\setminus\Gamma_t(\delta)} |\nabla\psi|^2 \mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Gamma_t(\delta)} |\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\psi|^2 \mathrm{d}x.$$

Proof: In the sequel, we shall fix $t \in [0,T_0]$. For sufficiently small $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1]$ and $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0]$, consider the set

$$\Gamma_\varepsilon := \{ x \in \Gamma_t(2\delta) \,|\, d_\Gamma(x,t) \in I_\varepsilon^p, p = P_{\Gamma_t}(x) \}$$

where I_ε^p is defined via

$$I_\varepsilon^p := (-\tfrac{3\delta}{4} + \varepsilon\tilde{h}_\varepsilon(p,t), \tfrac{3\delta}{4} + \varepsilon\tilde{h}_\varepsilon(p,t)).$$

As in [15] we assume for notational simplicity that $\delta = 1$. Then it is evident that $x \in \Gamma_\varepsilon$ is equivalent to $\rho \in I_\varepsilon := (-\frac{3}{4\varepsilon}, \frac{3}{4\varepsilon})$. If we denote $\tilde{\psi}(r,p) = \psi(x), \tilde{c}_A(r,p,t) = c_A(x,t)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_\Omega \left(|\nabla\psi(x)|^2 + \varepsilon^{-2} f''(c_A(x,t))\psi^2(x) \right) \mathrm{d}x \\ &\geq \int_{\Gamma_t} \int_{I_\varepsilon^p} \left(|\partial_r\tilde{\psi}(r,p)|^2 + \varepsilon^{-2} f''(\tilde{c}_A(r,p,t))\tilde{\psi}^2(r,p) \right) J_t(r,p) \mathrm{d}r\mathrm{d}p \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega\setminus\Gamma_\varepsilon} |\nabla\psi|^2 \mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Gamma_\varepsilon} |\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\psi|^2 \mathrm{d}x, \end{aligned} \tag{2.48}$$

since $f''(c_A(x,t)) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \Omega \setminus \Gamma_t(\frac{1}{2}) \supseteq \Omega \setminus \Gamma_\varepsilon$, $t \in [0,T_0]$, and $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ for sufficiently small ε_0. Moreover, since $|\nabla\psi(x)|^2 \geq |\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\psi(x)|^2$ for all $x \in \Gamma_t(1) \setminus \Gamma_\varepsilon$, and $\Gamma_t(1) \supseteq \Gamma_\varepsilon$ for sufficiently small ε, we have

$$\int_{\Omega\setminus\Gamma_\varepsilon} |\nabla\psi|^2 \mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Gamma_\varepsilon} |\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\psi|^2 \mathrm{d}x \geq \int_{\Omega\setminus\Gamma_t(1)} |\nabla\psi|^2 \mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Gamma_t(1)} |\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\psi|^2 \mathrm{d}x.$$

Let us fix $(p,t) \in \Gamma$ and perform a change of variables in r:

$$F_\varepsilon^p : I_\varepsilon \to I_\varepsilon^p,\ z \mapsto r = \varepsilon(z + \tilde{h}_\varepsilon(p,t)).$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{I_\varepsilon^p} \left(|\partial_r\tilde\psi(r,p)|^2 + \varepsilon^{-2} f''(\tilde c_A(r,p,t))\tilde\psi^2(r,p)\right) J_t(r,p)\mathrm{d}r\\
&= \int_{I_\varepsilon} \left(\varepsilon|\partial_r\tilde\psi(F_\varepsilon^p(z),p)|^2 + \varepsilon^{-1} f''(\tilde c_A(F_\varepsilon^p(z),p,t))\,\tilde\psi^2(F_\varepsilon^p(z),p)\right) J_t(F_\varepsilon^p(z),p)\mathrm{d}z\\
&= \varepsilon^{-2}\int_{I_\varepsilon} \left(|\partial_z\Psi(z,p)|^2 + f''(\tilde c_A(F_\varepsilon^p(z),p,t))\,\Psi^2(z,p)\right)\tilde J_t(z,p)\mathrm{d}z,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Psi(z,p) := \sqrt{\varepsilon}\tilde\psi(F_\varepsilon^p(z),p)$ and $\tilde J_t(z,p) := J_t(F_\varepsilon^p(z),p)$. Furthermore, with $\hat\Psi := \tilde J_t^{\frac12}\Psi$, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{I_\varepsilon^p} \left(|\partial_r\tilde\psi(r,p)|^2 + \varepsilon^{-2} f''(\tilde c_A(r,p,t))\tilde\psi^2(r,p)\right) J_t(r,p)\mathrm{d}r\\
&= \varepsilon^{-2}\int_{I_\varepsilon} (|\partial_z\hat\Psi(z,p)|^2 + f''(\theta_0(z) + \varepsilon^2\hat c_{A,2+}(z,p,t))\,\hat\Psi^2(z,p))\mathrm{d}z\\
&\quad - \varepsilon^{-2}\int_{I_\varepsilon} 2\partial_z\Psi(z,p)\tilde J_t^{\frac12}(z,p)\Psi(z,p)\partial_z\tilde J_t^{\frac12}(z,p) + \Psi^2(z,p)(\partial_z\tilde J_t^{\frac12}(z,p))^2\mathrm{d}z\\
&= \varepsilon^{-2}\int_{I_\varepsilon} (|\partial_z\hat\Psi(z,p)|^2 + f''(\theta_0(z) + \varepsilon^2\hat c_{A,2+}(z,p,t))\,\hat\Psi^2(z,p))\mathrm{d}z\\
&\quad - \varepsilon^{-2}\int_{I_\varepsilon} \frac12\partial_z\Psi^2(z,p)\partial_z\tilde J_t(z,p) + \frac14\Psi^2(z,p)(\partial_z\tilde J_t(z,p))^2/\tilde J_t(z,p)\mathrm{d}z\\
&= \varepsilon^{-2}\int_{I_\varepsilon} (|\partial_z\hat\Psi(z,p)|^2 + f''(\theta_0(z) + \varepsilon^2\hat c_{A,2+}(z,p,t))\,\hat\Psi^2(z,p))\mathrm{d}z\\
&\quad + \varepsilon^{-2}\int_{I_\varepsilon} \frac14\hat\Psi^2(z,p)\left[2\partial_z^2\tilde J_t(z,p)/\tilde J_t(z,p) - (\partial_z\tilde J_t(z,p))^2/\tilde J_t^2(z,p)\right]\mathrm{d}z\\
&\quad - \varepsilon^{-2}\frac12\hat\Psi^2(z,p)\partial_z\tilde J_t(z,p)/\tilde J_t(z,p)\Big|_{z=-3/4\varepsilon}^{z=3/4\varepsilon},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used integration by parts in the last step. We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{I_\varepsilon^p} \left(|\partial_r\tilde\psi(r,p)|^2 + \varepsilon^{-2} f''(\tilde c_A(r,p,t))\tilde\psi^2(r,p)\right) J_t(r,p)\mathrm{d}r\\
&= \varepsilon^{-2}\int_{I_\varepsilon} (|\partial_z\hat\Psi(z,p)|^2 + f''(\theta_0(z))\,\hat\Psi^2(z,p))\mathrm{d}z\\
&\quad + \int_{I_\varepsilon} \tilde q(z,p,t)\hat\Psi^2(z,p)\mathrm{d}z - \varepsilon^{-1}\frac12\hat\Psi^2(z,p)(\partial_r J_t)(F_\varepsilon^p(z),p)/J_t(F_\varepsilon^p(z),p)\Big|_{z=-3/4\varepsilon}^{z=3/4\varepsilon},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde q(z,p,t) &:= \varepsilon^{-2}\big(f''(\theta_0(z) + \varepsilon^2\hat c_{A,2+}(z,p,t)) - f''(\theta_0(z))\big)\\
&\quad + \frac14(2(\partial_r^2 J_t)(F_\varepsilon^p(z),p)/J_t(F_\varepsilon^p(z),p) - ((\partial_r J_t)(F_\varepsilon^p(z),p))^2/J_t^2(F_\varepsilon^p(z),p)).
\end{aligned}$$

Since Γ is smooth and compact and due to (2.47), we have

$$|\tilde q(z,p,t)| \le \sup_{|\xi|\le 2M+2}|f'''(\xi)| \sup_{(x,t)\in\Omega}|c_{A,2+}(x,t)| + C \le C'$$

for all $z\in\mathbb{R}$, $(p,t)\in\Gamma$, where M is the uniform bound in (2.47). Now, we can proceed as in [15, Proof of Theorem 2.3] to show that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Gamma_t}\int_{I_\varepsilon^p} \left(|\partial_r\tilde\psi(r,p)|^2 + \varepsilon^{-2} f''(\tilde c_A(r,p,t))\tilde\psi^2(r,p)\right) J_t(r,p)\mathrm{d}r\mathrm{d}p\\
&\ge -\frac1C\int_{\Gamma_t}\int_{I_\varepsilon} \Psi^2(z,p)\,\tilde J_t(z,p)\mathrm{d}z\mathrm{d}p \ge -\frac1C\int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \tilde\psi^2(r,p)\mathrm{d}r\mathrm{d}p \ge -\frac1C\int_\Omega \psi^2(x)\mathrm{d}x
\end{aligned}$$

for some $C>0$ independent of $\psi, t\in[0,T_0]$, and $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0]$. Altogether we obtain the claimed estimate. ∎

3 Approximation of the Stokes System

3.1 The Leading Part of the Velocity

The aim of this section is to construct an approximation of the following system

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rl} -\Delta\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_A+\nabla\tilde{p}_A &= -\varepsilon\,\mathrm{div}(\nabla c_{A,0}\otimes\nabla c_{A,0}),\\ \mathrm{div}\,\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_A &= 0,\\ \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_A|_{\partial\Omega} &= 0\end{array}\right. \tag{3.1}$$

with the aid of the method of formally matched asymptotics, where

$$c_{A,0}(x,t)=\zeta\circ d_\Gamma c_0^{in}+(1-\zeta\circ d_\Gamma)\left(c_+^{out}\chi_+ + c_-^{out}\chi_-\right)\ \text{ with } c_0^{in}(\rho):=\theta_0(\rho) \tag{3.2}$$

and $c_\pm^{out}=\pm1$, $\chi_\pm=\chi_{\Omega^\pm(t)}(x)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(x,t)&:=\frac{d_\Gamma(x,t)}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon(S(x,t),t),\\ h_\varepsilon(s,t)&:=h_1(s,t)+\varepsilon h_2(s,t),\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

and ζ is the cutoff function defined by (1.20). Let X_T be the function space defined by (2.25). Then we assume that $h_1, h_2=h_{2,\varepsilon}$ satisfy

$$h_1\in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T_0]),\qquad \sup_{0<\varepsilon\le\varepsilon_0}\|h_{2,\varepsilon}\|_{X_{T_\varepsilon}}\le M, \tag{3.4}$$

for some $\varepsilon_0\in(0,1)$, $M\ge1$, $T_\varepsilon\in(0,T_0]$ for all $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0]$. Note that h_1 is independent of ε but $h_2=h_{2,\varepsilon}$ does.

In the following we construct approximate solutions $(\mathbf{v}_A,p_A)$ to $(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_A,\tilde{p}_A)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{v}_A(x,t)&:=\zeta\circ d_\Gamma\mathbf{v}_A^{in}(\rho,x,t)+(1-\zeta\circ d_\Gamma)\left(\mathbf{v}_A^+(x,t)\chi_+ +\mathbf{v}_A^-(x,t)\chi_-\right),\\ p_A(x,t)&:=\zeta\circ d_\Gamma p_A^{in}(\rho,x,t)+(1-\zeta\circ d_\Gamma)\left(p_A^+(x,t)\chi_+ +p_A^-(x,t)\chi_-\right),\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

where ρ is understood via (3.3) and $\mathbf{v}_A^\pm, p_A^\pm, \mathbf{v}_A^{in}, p_A^{in}$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{v}_A^\pm(x,t)&:=\mathbf{v}_0^\pm(x,t)+\varepsilon\mathbf{v}_1^\pm(x,t)+\varepsilon^2\mathbf{v}_2^\pm(x,t),\\ p_A^\pm(x,t)&:=p_0^\pm(x,t)+\varepsilon p_1^\pm(x,t),\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{v}_A^{in}(\rho,x,t)&:=\mathbf{v}_0(\rho,x,t)+\varepsilon\mathbf{v}_1(\rho,x,t)+\varepsilon^2\mathbf{v}_2(\rho,x,t),\\ p_A^{in}(\rho,x,t)&:=\varepsilon^{-1}p_{-1}(\rho,x,t)+p_0(\rho,x,t)+\varepsilon p_1(\rho,x,t).\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

After determining $\mathbf{v}_j^\pm\colon\Omega^\pm(t)\to\mathbb{R}^2$ and $p_j^\pm\colon\Omega^\pm(t)\to\mathbb{R}$ in the sequel, these functions will be extended to smooth functions (denoted again by $\mathbf{v}_j^\pm$ and $p_j^\pm$) on $\Omega\times[0,T_0]$ such that $\mathrm{div}\,\mathbf{v}_j^\pm=0$ in $\Omega\times[0,T_0]$ and $\mathbf{v}_j^\pm|_{\partial\Omega}=0$. These extensions can e.g. be obtained by using the extension operator in [42, Chapter VI, §3] and correcting the divergence of the extension to obtain $\mathrm{div}\,\mathbf{v}_j^\pm=0$ with the aid of the Bogovskii operator, cf. e.g. [24, Chapter III, Theorem 3.2].

Here $\mathbf{v}_j^\pm, p_j^\pm, \mathbf{v}_j$, and p_j are defined as follows: $\mathbf{v}_0^\pm:=\mathbf{v}|_{\Omega^\pm(t)}, p_0^\pm:=p|_{\Omega^\pm(t)}$, where $(\mathbf{v},p)$ is the smooth solution of (1.11)-(1.16). Hence $(\mathbf{v}_0^\pm,p_0^\pm)$ solve

$$-\Delta\mathbf{v}_0^\pm+\nabla p_0^\pm=0 \qquad \text{in } \Omega^\pm(t), t\in(0,T_0), \tag{3.8a}$$

$$\mathrm{div}\,\mathbf{v}_0^\pm=0 \qquad \text{in } \Omega^\pm(t), t\in(0,T_0), \tag{3.8b}$$

$$[2D\mathbf{v}_0^\pm-p_0^\pm\mathbf{I}]\mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t}=-\sigma H\mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t} \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_t, t\in(0,T_0), \tag{3.8c}$$

$$[\mathbf{v}_0^\pm]=0 \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_t, t\in(0,T_0), \tag{3.8d}$$

$$\mathbf{v}_0^-|_{\partial\Omega}=0 \qquad \text{on } \partial\Omega\times(0,T_0), \tag{3.8e}$$

where we employed the notation

$$[f^{\pm}] = f^{+}|_{\Gamma_t} - f^{-}|_{\Gamma_t} \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_t. \tag{3.9}$$

In order to determine $\mathbf{v}_j, p_j$ satisfying suitable matching conditions for all $(x,t) \in \Gamma(3\delta)$, we use the ansatz

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_j(\rho,x,t) &= \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_j(\rho,x,t) + \eta(\rho) d_\Gamma(x,t)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_j(x,t), \qquad j=0,1,2,\\ p_j(\rho,x,t) &= \tilde{p}_j(\rho,x,t) + \eta(\rho) d_\Gamma(x,t)\hat{p}_j(x,t), \qquad j=-1,0,1, \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

where $\eta(\rho) := -1 + \frac{2}{\sigma}\int_{-\infty}^{\rho} \theta_0'(s)^2 \mathrm{d}s$ for all $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\eta\colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth, non-decreasing, and odd function such that

$$|\eta(\rho) \mp 1| \le Ce^{-\alpha|\rho|} \quad \text{if } \rho \gtrless 0 \tag{3.11}$$

for some $\alpha > 0$. Now we define for all $(\rho,x,t) \in \mathbb{R}\times\Gamma(3\delta)$

$$\tilde{p}_{-1}(\rho,x,t) = p_{-1}(\rho,x,t) = -(\theta_0'(\rho))^2,\ \hat{p}_{-1} \equiv 0,\ p_{-1}^{\pm} \equiv 0, \tag{3.12a}$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_0(\rho,x,t) = \tfrac{1}{2}(\mathbf{v}_0^+(x,t) + \mathbf{v}_0^-(x,t)), \quad \hat{\mathbf{v}}_0(x,t) = \tfrac{1}{2d_\Gamma}(\mathbf{v}_0^+(x,t) - \mathbf{v}_0^-(x,t)), \tag{3.12b}$$

$$\tilde{p}_0(\rho,x,t) = \tfrac{1}{2}(p_0^+(x,t) + p_0^-(x,t)) - \tfrac{\sigma}{2}\Delta d_\Gamma(x,t)\eta(\rho), \tag{3.12c}$$

$$\hat{p}_0(x,t) = \tfrac{1}{2d_\Gamma}\left(p_0^+(x,t) - p_0^-(x,t) + \sigma\Delta d_\Gamma(x,t)\right), \tag{3.12d}$$

where $(\mathbf{v}_1^{\pm}, p_1^{\pm})$ is the solution of the linear two-phase Stokes system

$$-\Delta\mathbf{v}_1^{\pm} + \nabla p_1^{\pm} = 0 \qquad \text{in } \Omega^{\pm}(t), t\in(0,T_0), \tag{3.13a}$$

$$\operatorname{div}\mathbf{v}_1^{\pm} = 0 \qquad \text{in } \Omega^{\pm}(t), t\in(0,T_0), \tag{3.13b}$$

$$\begin{aligned} [2D\mathbf{v}_1^{\pm} - p_1^{\pm}\mathbf{I}]\mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t} &= 2X_0^{*,-1}(h_1)(\mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t}\hat{p}_0 - 2\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0)\\ &\quad - \sigma X_0^{*,-1}(\Delta_\Gamma h_1)\mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t} \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_t, t\in(0,T_0), \end{aligned} \tag{3.13c}$$

$$[\mathbf{v}_1^{\pm}] = 0 \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_t, t\in(0,T_0), \tag{3.13d}$$

$$\mathbf{v}_1^{-} = 0 \qquad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \tag{3.13e}$$

Here and in the following, for a function f that vanishes on Γ, $\frac{1}{d_\Gamma}f(x,t)$ is understood as

$$\lim_{d_\Gamma\to 0}\frac{1}{d_\Gamma}f(x,t) = \partial_{\mathbf{n}}f(x,t), \quad \forall (x,t)\in\Gamma.$$

Moreover, we define

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1(\rho,x,t) = \tfrac{1}{2}(\mathbf{v}_1^+(x,t) + \mathbf{v}_1^-(x,t)), \quad \hat{\mathbf{v}}_1(x,t) = \tfrac{1}{2d_\Gamma}(\mathbf{v}_1^+(x,t) - \mathbf{v}_1^-(x,t)). \tag{3.14}$$

Furthermore $(\mathbf{v}_2, p_1)$ and $\mathbf{v}_2^{\pm}$ are determined by

$$\mathbf{v}_{2,\mathbf{n}}^- \equiv 0 \text{ on } \Omega\times[0,T_0], \tag{3.15a}$$

$$\mathbf{v}_{2,\mathbf{n}}^+(x,t) = -\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}(x,t)\int_{\mathbb{R}}(z + h_1(S(x,t),t))^2\eta'(z)\mathrm{d}z, \tag{3.15b}$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}}(\rho,x,t) = \mathbf{v}_{2,\mathbf{n}}^-(x,t) + d_\Gamma\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}}(x,t) - \tfrac{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}(x,t)}{d_\Gamma}\int_{-\infty}^{\rho}(z + h_1(S(x,t),t))^2\eta'(z)\mathrm{d}z, \tag{3.15c}$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}}(x,t) = \tfrac{1}{2d_\Gamma}\left(\tfrac{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}(x,t)}{d_\Gamma}\int_{\mathbb{R}}(z + h_1(S(x,t),t))^2\eta'(z)\mathrm{d}z + \mathbf{v}_{2,\mathbf{n}}^+(x,t) - \mathbf{v}_{2,\mathbf{n}}^-(x,t)\right) \tag{3.15d}$$

for all $(x,t)\in\Gamma(3\delta)$, $\rho\in\mathbb{R}$, and

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}}(\rho,x,t) = -\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\boldsymbol{\tau}}(P_{\Gamma_t}(x),t)\int_{-\infty}^{\rho}\int_{-\infty}^{y}\left((z^2 - h_1^2)\eta''(z) + 4z\eta'(z)\right)\mathrm{d}z\mathrm{d}y, \tag{3.16a}$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}}(x,t) = 0, \quad \mathbf{v}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}}(\rho,x,t) = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}}(\rho,x,t), \quad \mathbf{v}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}}^{\pm}(x,t) = \lim_{\rho\to\pm\infty}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}}(\rho,x,t), \tag{3.16b}$$

where h_1 is understood as a function of (x,t) via $h_1 = h_1(S(x,t),t)$. Moreover, $\mathbf{v}_2^{\pm}$ is extended smoothly to $\Omega\times[0,T_0]$ with $\mathbf{v}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}}^{-}|_{\partial\Omega}=0$. Finally we define the pressure terms by

$$\tilde{p}_1(\rho,x,t) = \tfrac{1}{2}\left(p_1^+(x,t)+p_1^-(x,t)-\int_{\mathbb{R}} a_1(z,x,t)\mathrm{d}z\right)+\int_{-\infty}^{\rho} a_1(z,x,t)\mathrm{d}z, \tag{3.17a}$$

$$\hat{p}_1(x,t) = \tfrac{1}{2d_\Gamma}\left(p_1^+(x,t)-p_1^-(x,t)-\int_{\mathbb{R}} a_1(z,x,t)\mathrm{d}z\right), \tag{3.17b}$$

$$p_1(\rho,x,t) = \tfrac{1+\eta(\rho)}{2}\left(p_1^+(x,t)-p_1^-(x,t)-\int_{\mathbb{R}} a_1(z,x,t)\mathrm{d}z\right)+\int_{-\infty}^{\rho} a_1(z,x,t)\mathrm{d}z, \tag{3.17c}$$

where a_1 is defined for all $(\rho,x,t)\in\mathbb{R}\times\Gamma(3\delta)$ by

$$\begin{aligned}
&a_1(\rho,x,t)\\
=&\partial_\rho^2\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}}(\rho,x,t)-\eta''(\rho)(h_2\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}(x,t)+(\rho+h_1)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\mathbf{n}}(x,t))-\eta'(\rho)\hat{p}_0(\rho+h_1)\\
&-2\eta'(\rho)(\nabla^\Gamma h_1\cdot\nabla_x(d_\Gamma\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0(x,t)))\cdot\mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t}\\
&+2\eta'(\rho)\mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t}\cdot\nabla_x(d_\Gamma\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\mathbf{n}}(x,t))+(h_1+\rho)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}(x,t)\eta'(\rho)\Delta_x d_\Gamma\\
&+\tfrac{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}(x,t)}{d_\Gamma}\partial_\rho\left((\rho+h_1)^2\eta'(\rho)\right)-\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}(x,t)h_2\eta''(\rho)+2(\rho+h_1)\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}(x,t)\eta'(\rho)\\
&-\partial_\rho(\theta_0'(\rho))^2|\nabla^\Gamma h_1|^2+(\theta_0'(\rho))^2\Delta^\Gamma h_1.
\end{aligned}\tag{3.18}$$

In the above formula, h_2 should be interpreted as a function of (x,t) via $h_2 = h_2(S(x,t),t)$. The motivation for defining a_1 can be seen at (A.50) in the appendix.

Remark 3.1 From the construction above one observes that $\mathbf{v}_0$ and p_0 only depend on the solutions $(\mathbf{v}_0^{\pm},p_0^{\pm})$ of the limit sharp interface problem (3.8) or equivalently (1.11)-(1.16). Moreover, $\mathbf{v}_1$ and $\mathbf{v}_2$ depend only on the choice of h_1 and p_1 depends on $h_1,h_{2,\varepsilon}$.

Lemma 3.2 *Under the assumption* (3.4)*, the functions* $(\mathbf{v}_0^{\pm},p_0^{\pm})$*,* $(\mathbf{v}_1^{\pm},p_1^{\pm})$*,* $(\mathbf{v}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}}^{\pm},\mathbf{v}_{2,\mathbf{n}}^{\pm})$ *and*

$$\{\tilde{p}_{-1},\hat{p}_{-1},\tilde{p}_0,\hat{p}_0,\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_0,\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0,\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1,\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1,\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_2,\hat{\mathbf{v}}_2\}$$

can be defined through (3.8)*,* (3.12)*,* (3.13)*, and* (3.16) *and they are all smooth. The functions* $\tilde{p}_1,\hat{p}_1$ *are continuous with respect to* $(\rho,x,t)\in\mathbb{R}\times\Gamma(3\delta)$ *and continuously differentiable with respect to* $\rho\in\mathbb{R}, x\in\Gamma_t(3\delta)$ *for almost every* $t\in(0,T_\varepsilon)$*.*

Proof: We first show that these definitions do not leads to circular reasoning: First of all Γ and $(\mathbf{v}_0^{\pm},p_0^{\pm})$ are given. Hence all the functions in (3.12) as well as $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}}$ are well defined. Moreover, $(\mathbf{v}_1^{\pm},p_1^{\pm})$ are determined by solving (3.13) for given h_1, which can be done because of Lemma 2.10 and Corollary 2.11. Hence $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1,\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1$ and thus $\mathbf{v}_1$ are well defined as well. With all the previous information, the first three formulae in (3.16) make sense and thus also (3.18). Finally $\tilde{p}_1,\hat{p}_1$ and p_1 can be defined via (3.16).

In order to show that these functions are continuously differentiable/smooth, we need the following facts: if $f(x)\in C^\ell(\overline{\Omega^\pm})$ and vanishes on Γ_t, then we can redefine $\frac{f(x)}{d_\Gamma}$ on Γ_t by $\lim_{d_\Gamma\to0}\frac{f(x)-f(P_{\Gamma_t}(x))}{d_\Gamma}$ and $\frac{f(x)}{d_\Gamma}\in C^{\ell-1}(\overline{\Omega^\pm})$. One can verify that all the functions defined in (3.12) are smooth, using (3.8). $\frac{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}}{d_\Gamma}$ is smooth because $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}$ vanishes on the interface due to the divergence-free condition of $\mathbf{v}_0^{\pm}$ and $[\mathbf{v}_0^{\pm}]:=\mathbf{v}_0^+|_{\Gamma_t}-\mathbf{v}_0^-|_{\Gamma_t}=0$.

Now we consider $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_2$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_2$. We substitute the formula for $\mathbf{v}_{2,\mathbf{n}}^+$ in (3.15) into that of $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}}$ and deduce that, for all $x\in\Omega\backslash\Gamma_t, t\in[0,T_0]$

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}}(x,t)=\tfrac{1}{2d_\Gamma}\left[\left(\tfrac{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}(x,t)}{d_\Gamma}-\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}(P_{\Gamma_t}(x),t)\right)\int_{\mathbb{R}}(z+h_1)^2\eta'(z)dz+\mathbf{v}_{2,\mathbf{n}}^+(x)-\mathbf{v}_{2,\mathbf{n}}^+(P_{\Gamma_t}(x),t)\right]$$

and the expressions in the rectangle bracket vanishes on Γ_t, which implies that $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}}$ as well as $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}}$ are smooth. On the other hand, it can be verified that the double integral defining (3.16a) is well-defined as the integral $\int_{-\infty}^{y} r\eta'(r)dr$ vanishes when $y\le-1$ because of (3.11). So $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}}$ is smooth in the tangent direction and is constant on the normal direction.

The conclusion for $\hat{p}_1$ follows from (A.52) together with the following formula

$$\hat{p}_1(x,t) = \tfrac{1}{2d_\Gamma}\Big(p_1^+(x,t) - p_1^-(x,t) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} a_1(\rho,x,t)\mathrm{d}\rho \underbrace{-p_1^+(P_{\Gamma_t}(x),t)) + p_1^-(P_{\Gamma_t}(x),t) + \int_{\mathbb{R}} a_1(\rho,P_{\Gamma_t}(x),t)\mathrm{d}\rho}_{=0}\Big),$$

where a_1 is smooth in normal direction and continuous in all directions since it depends on smooth quantities and the push-forward of $h_{2,\varepsilon} \in X_{T_\varepsilon} \hookrightarrow BUC([0,T_\varepsilon];H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^1)) \cap L^4(0,T_\varepsilon;C^1(\mathbb{T}^1))$, $H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^1) \hookrightarrow C^0(\mathbb{T}^1)$. ∎

Now we construct the outer expansion in (3.6). The following statement can be readily verified:

Lemma 3.3 *There exists some $\alpha > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that for all $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ and $m, \ell = 0, 1, 2$, $n = 0, 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{(x,t)\in\Gamma(3\delta)} |D_x^m \partial_t^n \partial_\rho^\ell (\mathbf{v}_i(\pm\rho,x,t) - \mathbf{v}_i^\pm(x,t))| \le Ce^{-\alpha|\rho|} \text{ for all } 0 \le i \le 2, \\ \sup_{(x,t)\in\Gamma(3\delta)} |\partial_\rho^\ell (p_i(\pm\rho,x,t) - p_i^\pm(x,t))| \le Ce^{-\alpha|\rho|} \text{ for all } -1 \le i \le 1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

The following lemma is crucial in the inner expansion and its proof is given in Section A.2 below.

Lemma 3.4 *If we define $(\mathbf{v}_A^{in}, p_A^{in})$ through (3.7), then*

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta \mathbf{v}_A^{in} + \nabla p_A^{in} =& -\varepsilon \operatorname{div}(\nabla c_0^{in} \otimes \nabla c_0^{in}) + r_\varepsilon\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon, x, t\right) + \tilde{r}_\varepsilon\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon, x, t\right) \\ &+ \sum_{i'\le 2; 0\le i,j,j'\le 1} \varepsilon^2 R_\varepsilon^{i'j'ij}(x,t)(\partial_s^{j'} h_2)^j (\partial_s^{i'} h_2)^i \\ &+ \sum_{0\le i,i',j,j',k,k'\le 1} \varepsilon^2 \tilde{R}_\varepsilon^{i'j'k'ijk}(x,t)(\partial_s^{j'} h_2)^j (\partial_s^{i'} h_2)^i (\partial_s^{k'} h_2)^k \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

$$\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_A^{in} = \sum_{0\le i,i'\le 1} g_\varepsilon^{i'i}\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon, x, t\right)(\partial_s^{i'} h_2)^i + \varepsilon^2 \tilde{g}_\varepsilon(x,t) \tag{3.21}$$

in $\Gamma_t(3\delta)$ where h_ε is defined through (3.4) and

$$(r_\varepsilon)_{0<\varepsilon<1} \in \mathcal{R}^0_{0,\alpha}, \quad (\tilde{r}_\varepsilon)_{0<\varepsilon<1} \in \mathcal{R}_{1,\alpha}, \quad (g_\varepsilon^{i'i})_{0<\varepsilon<1} \in \mathcal{R}^0_{1,\alpha} \tag{3.22}$$

for some $\alpha > 0$ and $R_\varepsilon^{i'j'ij}, \tilde{R}_\varepsilon^{i'j'k'ijk}, \tilde{g}_\varepsilon$ are uniformly bounded with respect to $\varepsilon \in (0,1], (x,t) \in \Gamma(3\delta)$.

The main result of this section is:

Theorem 3.5 *Under the assumptions (3.4), there is some $C(M) > 0$, independent of $(T_\varepsilon)_{0<\varepsilon\le\varepsilon_0}$ and $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1]$, such that*

$$\|\mathbf{v}_A - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_A\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))} \le C(M)(T^{\frac{1}{4}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}})\varepsilon^2$$

for all $0 < T \le T_\varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$.

Proof: We will use that

$$\left|\frac{d_\Gamma(x,t)}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon(S(x,t),t)\right| \ge \frac{\delta}{2\varepsilon} \quad \text{for all } (x,t) \in \Gamma(3\delta) \setminus \Gamma(\delta), t \le T_\varepsilon \tag{3.23}$$

if $0 < \varepsilon \le \min(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_0)$ for sufficiently small $\varepsilon_1 \in (0,1)$ in dependence of M. Moreover, we will choose ε_1 such that $\varepsilon_1 M \le 1$. First of all, because of (3.19) and (2.26), we have for $1 \le i' \le 2, 0 \le j' \le 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\partial_x^{i'}(\zeta\circ d_\Gamma)\partial_x^{j'}(\mathbf{v}_A^{in}-\mathbf{v}_A^+\chi_+-\mathbf{v}_A^-\chi_-)\|_{L^\infty(0,T_\varepsilon;L^2(\Omega))}\le Ce^{-\frac{\alpha\delta}{2\varepsilon}},\\&\|\partial_x^{i'}(\zeta\circ d_\Gamma)(p_A^{in}-p_A^+\chi_+-p_A^-\chi_-)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,T_\varepsilon))}\le Ce^{-\frac{\alpha\delta}{2\varepsilon}}.\end{aligned}\tag{3.24}$$

So it follows from (3.5) that

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta\mathbf{v}_A =&(\zeta\circ d_\Gamma)\Delta\mathbf{v}_A^{in}+(1-\zeta\circ d_\Gamma)\left(\Delta\mathbf{v}_A^+\chi_+ +\Delta\mathbf{v}_A^-\chi_-\right)\\&+2\nabla(\zeta\circ d_\Gamma)\cdot\nabla\left(\mathbf{v}_A^{in}-\mathbf{v}_A^+\chi_+-\mathbf{v}_A^-\chi_-\right)+\Delta(\zeta\circ d_\Gamma)\left(\mathbf{v}_A^{in}-\mathbf{v}_A^+\chi_+-\mathbf{v}_A^-\chi_-\right),\\\nabla p_A =&(\zeta\circ d_\Gamma)\nabla p_A^{in}+(1-\zeta\circ d_\Gamma)\left(\nabla p_A^+\chi_+ +\nabla p_A^-\chi_-\right)+\nabla(\zeta\circ d_\Gamma)\left(p_A^{in}-p_A^+\chi_+-p_A^-\chi_-\right).\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, it follows from (3.6) and the first equation of (3.8) and (3.13) that

$$-\Delta\mathbf{v}_A^+\chi_+ +\nabla p_A^+\chi_+ -\Delta\mathbf{v}_A^-\chi_- +\nabla p_A^-\chi_- = O(\varepsilon^2)\quad \text{in } L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,T_\varepsilon)).$$

The above two formulas together with (3.1) imply

$$\begin{aligned}&-\Delta(\mathbf{v}_A-\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_A)+\nabla(p_A-\tilde p_A)\\=&\zeta\circ d_\Gamma(-\Delta\mathbf{v}_A^{in}+\nabla p_A^{in})+\varepsilon\,\mathrm{div}(\nabla c_{A,0}\otimes\nabla c_{A,0})\\&-(1-\zeta\circ d_\Gamma)(-\Delta\mathbf{v}_A^+\chi_+ +\nabla p_A^+\chi_+ -\Delta\mathbf{v}_A^-\chi_- +\nabla p_A^-\chi_-)\\&+\varepsilon(1-\zeta\circ d_\Gamma)\,\mathrm{div}(\nabla c_{A,0}\otimes\nabla c_{A,0})+O(e^{-\frac{\alpha\delta}{2\varepsilon}})\\=&\zeta\circ d_\Gamma(-\Delta\mathbf{v}_A^{in}+\nabla p_A^{in})+\varepsilon\,\mathrm{div}(\nabla c_{A,0}\otimes\nabla c_{A,0})+O(\varepsilon^2)\text{ in }L^\infty(0,T_\varepsilon;L^2(\Omega)).\end{aligned}\tag{3.25}$$

To expand the concentration term, we need the following formula which can be easily derived from (3.2) together with $\nabla c_{0,\pm}^{out}=0$:

$$\nabla c_{A,0}=\nabla(\zeta\circ d_\Gamma)(c_0^{in}-c_{0,+}^{out}\chi_+ -c_{0,-}^{out}\chi_-)+\zeta\circ d_\Gamma\nabla c_0^{in}.\tag{3.26}$$

Applying the above formula to the second term on the right hand side of (3.25) and extract the leading terms, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&-\Delta(\mathbf{v}_A-\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_A)+\nabla(p_A-\tilde p_A)\\=&\zeta\circ d_\Gamma\left(-\Delta\mathbf{v}_A^{in}+\nabla p_A^{in}+\varepsilon\,\mathrm{div}(\nabla c_0^{in}\otimes\nabla c_0^{in})\right)+O(\varepsilon^2)\text{ in }L^\infty(0,T_\varepsilon;L^2(\Omega)).\end{aligned}\tag{3.27}$$

Next we multiply (3.20) by an arbitrary $\varphi\in C_{0,\sigma}^\infty(\Omega)$ and we employ Lemma 3.4 to estimate the first part on the right hand side of (3.27):

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\int_\Omega\zeta\circ d_\Gamma(-\Delta\mathbf{v}_A^{in}+\nabla p_A^{in}+\varepsilon\,\mathrm{div}(\nabla c_0^{in}\otimes\nabla c_0^{in}))\cdot\varphi\mathrm{d}x\right|\\&\le\int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)}\left|r_\varepsilon\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon,x,t\right)\cdot\varphi\right|\mathrm{d}x+\int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)}\left|\tilde r_\varepsilon\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon,x,t\right)\cdot\varphi\right|\mathrm{d}x\\&\quad+\int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)}\left|\sum_{i'\le2;0\le i,j,j'\le1}\varepsilon^2R_\varepsilon^{i'j'ij}(x,t)(\partial_s^{j'}h_2)^j(\partial_s^{i'}h_2)^i\varphi\right|\mathrm{d}x\\&\quad+\int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)}\left|\sum_{0\le i,j,k,i',j',k'\le1}\varepsilon^2\tilde R_\varepsilon^{i'j'k'ijk}(x,t)(\partial_s^{j'}h_2)^j(\partial_s^{i'}h_2)^i(\partial_s^{k'}h_2)^k\varphi\right|\mathrm{d}x\\&\quad+C\varepsilon^2\|\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\qquad\text{for all }t\in(0,T_\varepsilon).\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have the embeddings $H^{3/2}(\mathbb{T}^1)\hookrightarrow W_p^1(\mathbb{T}^1)$ for every $1\le p<\infty$ and the estimate

$$\left(\int_{|r|\le2\delta}\mathrm{ess\,sup}_{s\in\mathbb{T}^1}|\varphi(X_0(s,t)+r\mathbf{n}(s,t))|^4\mathrm{d}r\right)^{\frac14}\le C\|\varphi\|_{H^1(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}$$

for some $C > 0$ independent of φ. This estimate is proved in the same way as (2.20) with the role of $r \in (-2\delta, 2\delta)$ and $s \in \mathbb{T}^1$ interchanged. These together with (2.26), (3.4), (3.22) and the first inequality in Corollary 2.7 yields

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\int_\Omega \zeta \circ d_\Gamma(-\Delta \mathbf{v}_A^{in} + \nabla p_A^{in} + \varepsilon \operatorname{div}(\nabla c_0^{in} \otimes \nabla c_0^{in})) \cdot \varphi \mathrm{d}x\right| \\ &\le C(M)\varepsilon^2 \left(1 + \|h_2(t)\|_{H^2(\mathbb{T}^1)}\|h_2(t)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^1)} + \|h_2(t)\|^3_{W^1_3(\mathbb{T}^1)}\right)\|\varphi\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ &\le C(M)\varepsilon^2 \left(1 + \|h_2(t)\|_{H^2(\mathbb{T}^1)}\right)\|\varphi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

Combining (3.27) and (3.28) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_\Omega \nabla(\mathbf{v}_A - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_A) : \nabla\varphi \mathrm{d}x\right| &= \left|\int_\Omega (-\Delta(\mathbf{v}_A - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_A) + \nabla(p_A - \tilde{p}_A)) \cdot \varphi \mathrm{d}x\right| \\ &\le C(M)\varepsilon^2 \left(1 + \|h_2(t)\|_{H^2(\mathbb{T}^1)}\right)\|\varphi\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_\varepsilon),\end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

where $h_2 \in X_{T_\varepsilon} \hookrightarrow L^4(0, T_\varepsilon; H^2(\mathbb{T}^1))$ is bounded. On the other hand, using (3.6) together with $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_j^\pm = 0$ for $j = 0, 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_A &= \operatorname{div}\left(\zeta \circ d_\Gamma \mathbf{v}_A^{in} + (1 - \zeta \circ d_\Gamma)\left(\mathbf{v}_A^+ \chi_+ + \mathbf{v}_A^- \chi_-\right)\right) \\ &= \nabla(\zeta \circ d_\Gamma) \cdot \left(\mathbf{v}_A^{in} - \mathbf{v}_A^+ \chi_+ - \mathbf{v}_A^- \chi_-\right) + (\zeta \circ d_\Gamma) \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_A^{in} + O(\varepsilon^2) \text{ in } L^\infty(\Omega \times [0, T_\varepsilon]).\end{aligned}$$

So we can apply (3.21) to the above estimate and then use the second inequality in Corollary 2.7 as well as (3.24) :

$$\|\operatorname{div}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_A - \mathbf{v}_A)\|_{L^2(\Omega \times (0,T_\varepsilon))} \le C\varepsilon^2(T^{\frac{1}{2}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}})(\|h_2\|_{L^2(0,T_\varepsilon;H^{5/2}(\mathbb{T}^1))} + 1). \tag{3.30}$$

Combining (3.29) and (3.30) together with standard results on the weak solutions of the Stokes equation with general divergence leads to

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_A - \mathbf{v}_A\|_{L^2(0,T_\varepsilon;H^1)} \le C(M)\varepsilon^2(T^{\frac{1}{4}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

This implies the desired result due to (3.4). ∎

3.2 The Leading Error in the Velocity

Within this subsection we denote $u_1 = c_\varepsilon - c_{A,0}$, where $c_{A,0}$ is defined by (3.2) for given $h_1, h_{2,\varepsilon} = h_2$ satisfying (3.4) for some $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ and $M \ge 1$. Moreover, we will often write $\mathbf{n}$ instead of $\mathbf{n}_\Gamma$ for simplicity.

In the following $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2 \colon \Omega \times [0, T_0] \to \mathbb{R}^2$, $q_1, q_2 \colon \Omega \times [0, T_0] \to \mathbb{R}$ are the solutions of

$$-\Delta\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1 + \nabla q_1 = -\varepsilon \operatorname{div}((\nabla c_{A,0} - \mathbf{g}) \otimes \nabla u_1) - \varepsilon \operatorname{div}(\nabla u_1 \otimes (\nabla c_{A,0} - \mathbf{g})) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{3.31}$$

$$\operatorname{div}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1 = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{3.32}$$

$$-\Delta\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2 + \nabla q_2 = -\varepsilon \operatorname{div}(\mathbf{g} \otimes \nabla u_1) - \varepsilon \operatorname{div}(\nabla u_1 \otimes \mathbf{g}) - \varepsilon \operatorname{div}(\nabla u_1 \otimes \nabla u_1) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{3.33}$$

$$\operatorname{div}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2 = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{3.34}$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1|_{\partial\Omega} = \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2|_{\partial\Omega} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \tag{3.35}$$

for every $t \in [0, T_0]$, where

$$\mathbf{g} = -\zeta \circ d_\Gamma \, \theta_0'(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon)\varepsilon\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} h_{2,\varepsilon}.$$

Then $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_A + \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1 + \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2$ because of the unique solvability of the Stokes systems. According to (3.26),

$$\nabla c_{A,0} - \mathbf{g} = \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \, \theta_0'(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon)(\tfrac{\nabla d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} h_1) + \nabla d_\Gamma \zeta' \circ d_\Gamma \, \left(\theta_0(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon) - \chi_+ + \chi_-\right). \tag{3.36}$$

It will turn out that $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1$ is the leading part in the error estimates for $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_A$ and it plays an important role in the construction of c_A. Before proceeding the estimates, we give a few words about the Stokes equations above. These systems will be understood in the weak sense. E.g., $\mathbf{v} = \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1 \in H_0^1(\Omega)^2 \cap L^2_\sigma(\Omega)$ solves

$$\int_\Omega \nabla \mathbf{v} : \nabla \varphi \mathrm{d}x = \langle F, \varphi \rangle \qquad \text{for all } \varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)^2 \cap L^2_\sigma(\Omega), \tag{3.37}$$

where $F \in (H_0^1(\Omega)^2 \cap L^2_\sigma(\Omega))'$ is defined by

$$\langle F, \varphi \rangle := \varepsilon \int_\Omega ((\nabla c_{A,0} - \mathbf{g}) \otimes \nabla u_1 + \nabla u_1 \otimes (\nabla c_{A,0} - \mathbf{g})) : \nabla \varphi \mathrm{d}x$$

for all $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega)^2 \cap L^2_\sigma(\Omega)$. Here $L^2_\sigma(\Omega)$ is the closure of divergence free $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$-vector fields in $L^2(\Omega)$. Existence of weak solutions for every $\varepsilon > 0$ is a consequence of the Lax-Milgram Theorem. Moreover, if $\mathbf{v} \in H_0^1(\Omega)^2 \cap L^2_\sigma(\Omega)$ solves (3.37) for some $F \in (H_0^1(\Omega)^2 \cap L^2_\sigma(\Omega))'$ and $1 < p < \infty$, then there is some $C_p > 0$ independent of $\mathbf{v}$ and F such that

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C \sup_{0 \neq \varphi \in W^2_{p'}(\Omega) \cap W^1_{p',0}(\Omega) \cap L^2_\sigma(\Omega)} \frac{|\langle F, \varphi \rangle|}{\|\varphi\|_{W^2_{p'}(\Omega)}} \tag{3.38}$$

where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$. The latter estimate follows by duality from the well-known fact that the Stokes operator $A_{p'} : W^2_{p'}(\Omega)^2 \cap W^1_{p',0}(\Omega)^2 \cap L^2_\sigma(\Omega) \to L^{p'}_\sigma(\Omega)$ is bijective.

Proposition 3.6 *Let $N = 2$, $1 < q < 2$ and $1 \leq r \leq 2$. We assume that there are some $R \geq 1$, $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1)$, $T_\varepsilon \in (0, T_0]$ such that*

$$\|c_\varepsilon - c_{A,0}\|_{L^4(0,T_\varepsilon;L^2(\Omega))} + \|\nabla(c_\varepsilon - c_{A,0})\|_{L^2(\Omega \times (0,T_\varepsilon) \setminus \Gamma(\delta))} \leq 2R\varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{3.39a}$$

$$\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}(c_\varepsilon - c_{A,0})\|_{L^2(\Omega \times (0,T_\varepsilon) \cap \Gamma(2\delta))} + \varepsilon \|\partial_{\mathbf{n}}(c_\varepsilon - c_{A,0})\|_{L^2(\Omega \times (0,T_\varepsilon) \cap \Gamma(2\delta))} \leq 2R\varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}} \tag{3.39b}$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ and (3.4) holds true for some $M \geq 1$. Then there are some $C(R) > 0$, $\varepsilon_1 \in (0,1)$, independent of $T_\varepsilon, \varepsilon_0$ such that

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1\|_{L^2(0,T,H^1(\Omega))} \leq C(R)\varepsilon^N, \tag{3.40a}$$

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1\|_{L^2(0,T,L^2(\Omega))} \leq C(R)\left(T^{\frac{1}{4}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)\varepsilon^N, \tag{3.40b}$$

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2\|_{L^r(0,T,L^q(\Omega))} \leq C(R)\varepsilon^{\frac{4}{r}} \tag{3.40c}$$

for all $0 < T \leq T_\varepsilon$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \min(\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1)]$. Moreover, $C(R)$ is independent of M.

Proof: Within this proof we will often write h_ε instead of $h_\varepsilon(S(x,t),t)$ for brevity. We also recall that $u_1 = c_\varepsilon - c_{A,0}$. Because of (3.23), we have

$$\left|\theta_0\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma(x,t)}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon(S(x,t),t)\right) - \chi_+(x,t) + \chi_-(x,t)\right| + \left|\theta_0'\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma(x,t)}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon(S(x,t),t)\right)\right| \leq Ce^{-\frac{\alpha\delta}{2\varepsilon}}$$

for all $(x,t) \in \Gamma(3\delta) \setminus \Gamma(\delta)$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq \min(\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1)$ because of (1.19) provided ε_1 is chosen sufficiently small (in dependence on M). In particular, we choose $\varepsilon_1 \leq \frac{1}{M}$ such that $\varepsilon \|h_{2,\varepsilon}\|_{X_{T_\varepsilon}} \leq 1$ independent of the choice of M. Here C can be chosen independent of M. According to the definition of ζ at (1.20), all terms involving derivatives of $\zeta \circ d_\Gamma$ will provide terms of order $O(e^{-\frac{\alpha\delta}{2\varepsilon}})$ in the following and will be negligible.

Proof of (3.40a)*:* Using identity (3.36) and $\nabla u_1 = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u_1 + \mathbf{n}\partial_{\mathbf{n}} u_1$ in $\Gamma(3\delta)$, we have for all

$\psi \in H^1(\Omega)^2 \cap L^2_\sigma(\Omega)$ with $\|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \le 1$ that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega \varepsilon(\nabla c_{A,0} - \mathbf{g}) \otimes \nabla u_1 : \nabla\psi \mathrm{d}x = \int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \varepsilon(\nabla c_{A,0} - \mathbf{g}) \otimes \nabla u_1 : \nabla\psi \mathrm{d}x + O(e^{-\frac{\alpha\delta}{2\varepsilon}}) \\
&= \int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \zeta \circ d_\Gamma\, \theta_0'\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon(S(x,t),t)\right)(\mathbf{n} - \varepsilon\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} h_1(S(x,t),t)) \otimes \nabla u_1 : \nabla\psi \mathrm{d}x + O(e^{-\frac{\alpha\delta}{2\varepsilon}}) \\
&= \int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \zeta \circ d_\Gamma\, \theta_0'\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon\right)\mathbf{n} \otimes \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u_1 : \nabla\psi \mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \zeta \circ d_\Gamma\, \theta_0'\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon\right)\mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{n}\partial_{\mathbf{n}} u_1 : \nabla\psi \mathrm{d}x \\
&\quad - \int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \zeta \circ d_\Gamma\, \theta_0'\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon\right)(\varepsilon\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} h_1) \otimes \nabla u_1 : \nabla\psi \mathrm{d}x + O(e^{-\frac{\alpha\delta}{2\varepsilon}}) \\
&\equiv I + II + III + O(e^{-\frac{\alpha\delta}{2\varepsilon}}) \qquad \text{in } L^2(0,T_\varepsilon).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.41}
$$

Therefore the following estimates are due to Cauchy-Schwarz inequality:

$$
|I| \le C\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u_1(t)\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \quad |III| \le C\varepsilon\|\nabla u_1(t)\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}.
$$

To estimate II, we employ the formula $\mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{n} : \nabla\psi = \partial_{\mathbf{n}}\psi_{\mathbf{n}} = -\operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} \psi$, a consequence of the divergence-free condition $\operatorname{div}\psi = 0$. This together with (2.13) implies

$$
\begin{aligned}
II &= -\int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \zeta \circ d_\Gamma\, \theta_0'\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon\right)\partial_{\mathbf{n}} u_1 \operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} \psi \mathrm{d}x \\
&= \int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \zeta \circ d_\Gamma\, \theta_0'\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon\right)(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\partial_{\mathbf{n}} u_1 + \kappa\mathbf{n}\partial_{\mathbf{n}} u_1) \cdot \psi \mathrm{d}x \\
&\quad - \int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \zeta \circ d_\Gamma\, \theta_0''\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon\right)\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} h_\varepsilon \partial_{\mathbf{n}} u_1 \cdot \psi \mathrm{d}x \\
&= \int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \zeta \circ d_\Gamma\, \theta_0'\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon\right)\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u_1 \cdot \psi \mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \zeta \circ d_\Gamma\, \theta_0'\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon\right)[\partial_{\mathbf{n}}, \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}] u_1 \cdot \psi \mathrm{d}x \\
&\quad + \int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \zeta \circ d_\Gamma\, \left(-\theta_0''\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon\right)\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} h_\varepsilon + \theta_0'\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon\right)\kappa\mathbf{n}\right)\partial_{\mathbf{n}} u_1 \cdot \psi \mathrm{d}x + O(e^{-\frac{\alpha\delta}{2\varepsilon}}) \\
&= -\int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \zeta \circ d_\Gamma\, \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\theta_0''\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon\right)\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u_1 \cdot \psi \mathrm{d}x - \int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \zeta \circ d_\Gamma\, \theta_0'\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon\right)\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u_1 \cdot \partial_{\mathbf{n}}\psi \mathrm{d}x \\
&\quad + \int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \zeta \circ d_\Gamma\, \theta_0'\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon\right)[\partial_{\mathbf{n}}, \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}] u_1 \cdot \psi \mathrm{d}x \\
&\quad + \int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \zeta \circ d_\Gamma\, \left(-\theta_0''\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon\right)\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} h_\varepsilon + \theta_0'\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon\right)\kappa\mathbf{n}\right)\partial_{\mathbf{n}} u_1 \cdot \psi \mathrm{d}x + O(e^{-\frac{\alpha\delta}{2\varepsilon}}) \\
&\equiv II_1 + II_2 + II_3 + II_4 + O(e^{-\frac{\alpha\delta}{2\varepsilon}}) \qquad \text{in } L^2(0,T_\varepsilon).
\end{aligned}
$$

In the above calculation, $[\cdot,\cdot]$ denotes the commutator of two differential operators. So it follows from assumption (3.4) and Lemma 2.4 that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|II_1| \le \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\|\theta_0''\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u_1\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\|\psi\|_{L^{2,\infty}(\Gamma_t(2\delta))} \le C\tfrac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u_1\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \\
&|II_2| \le C\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u_1\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \\
&|II_3| \le C\sqrt{\varepsilon}\|\theta_0'\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u_1\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \le C'\sqrt{\varepsilon}\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u_1\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \\
&|II_4| \le C\sqrt{\varepsilon}\left(\|\theta_0''\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} + \|\theta_0'\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}\right)\|\partial_{\mathbf{n}} u_1\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\|\psi\|_{L^{4,\infty}(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\left(1 + \varepsilon\|\partial_s h_{2,\varepsilon}\|_{L^4(\mathbb{T}^1)}\right) \\
&\qquad \le C\sqrt{\varepsilon}\|\partial_{\mathbf{n}} u_1\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)},
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have used (2.12), (2.24) and the following imbedding theorem

$$
H^1(\Gamma_t(2\delta)) \hookrightarrow L^{4,\infty}(\Gamma_t(2\delta)), \quad H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^1) \hookrightarrow W^1_4(\mathbb{T}^1).
$$

Similarly, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega \varepsilon \nabla u_1 \otimes (\nabla c_{A,0} - \mathbf{g}) : \nabla \psi \mathrm{d}x \\
&= \int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \, \theta_0' \left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon \right) \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u_1 \otimes \mathbf{n} : \nabla \psi \mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \, \theta_0' \left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon \right) \partial_{\mathbf{n}} u_1 \mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{n} : \nabla \psi \mathrm{d}x \\
&- \int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \, \theta_0' \left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon \right) (\varepsilon \nabla u_1 \otimes \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} h_1) : \nabla \psi \mathrm{d}x + O(e^{-\frac{\alpha\delta}{2\varepsilon}}) \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T_\varepsilon),
\end{aligned}$$

where each term can be estimated as before. Hence we obtain

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1(t)\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \le C \left(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u_1\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))} + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \|\partial_{\mathbf{n}} u_1\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))} + e^{-\frac{\alpha\delta}{2\varepsilon}} \right) \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T_\varepsilon)$$

and this together with (3.39) leads to (3.40a).

Proof of (3.40b)*:* We still need to estimate the same terms as in (3.41). But it is sufficient to estimate II since all other terms can be estimates in terms of $C\varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}} \|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$. To this end let $\psi \in H^2(\Omega)^2 \cap H_0^1(\Omega)^2 \cap L^2_\sigma(\Omega)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
II &= \int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \, \theta_0' \left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon \right) u_1 \partial_{\mathbf{n}} \operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} \psi \mathrm{d}x \\
&\quad + \int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \, \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon} \theta_0'' \left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon \right) u_1 \operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} \psi \mathrm{d}x + O(e^{-\frac{\alpha\delta}{2\varepsilon}}) \text{ in } L^2(0, T_\varepsilon)
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore Lemma 2.4 implies

$$\begin{aligned}
|II| &\le C \|u_1(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \left(\|\psi\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\varepsilon} \|\theta_0''\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \| \operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} \psi \|_{L^{2,\infty}(\Gamma_t(2\delta))} \right) + O(e^{-\frac{\alpha\delta}{2\varepsilon}}) \\
&\le C' \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|u_1(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\psi\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + O(e^{-\frac{\alpha\delta}{2\varepsilon}}) \qquad \text{in } L^2(0, T_\varepsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

Since we have $\|u_1\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2)} \le C(R) T^{\frac{1}{4}} \varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}}$ for all $0 < T \le T_\varepsilon$ due to (3.39), we obtain (3.40b).

Proof of (3.40c)*:* Because of $W^2_q(\Omega) \hookrightarrow C^0(\overline{\Omega})$, we have the imbedding $L^1(\Omega) \hookrightarrow (W^2_q(\Omega))'$ and it follows from (3.38) that

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2(t, \cdot)\|_{L^r(0,T;L^q)} \le C\varepsilon \left(\|\nabla u_1 \otimes \nabla u_1\|_{L^r(0,T;L^1)} + \|\mathbf{g} \otimes \nabla u_1\|_{L^r(0,T;L^1)} \right).$$

On the other hand

$$\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla u_1\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} \le \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla c_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla c_{A,0}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} \le C$$

uniformly in $T \in (0, T_\varepsilon]$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \min(\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1)]$ because of the energy estimate (1.10) for (1.5)-(1.9) and the explicit form of $c_{A,0}$ at (3.2). Altogether we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2\|_{L^r(0,T;L^q)} \le C\varepsilon \left(\|\nabla u_1 \otimes \nabla u_1\|_{L^r(0,T;L^1)} + \|\mathbf{g} \otimes \nabla u_1\|_{L^r(0,T;L^1)} \right) \\
&\le C\varepsilon \left(\|\nabla u_1\|^{\frac{2}{r}}_{L^2(0,T;L^2)} \|\nabla u_1\|^{2-\frac{2}{r}}_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} + \varepsilon \|\partial_s h_{2,\varepsilon}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\mathbb{T}^1))} \|\theta_0'(\tfrac{\cdot}{\varepsilon})\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \|\nabla u_1\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2)} \right) \\
&\le C \left(\varepsilon^{1+\frac{2}{r}\frac{3}{2}-1+\frac{1}{r}} + M\varepsilon^{N+2} \right) \le C' \varepsilon^{\frac{4}{r}} \qquad \text{for all } 0 < t \le T_\varepsilon, \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have completed the proof. ∎

4 Approximate Solution for the Allen-Cahn Part

Let us start with an overview of this central section. The goal of this section is to construct the full expansion of (1.7) through Ansatz using inner and outer expansions, cf. (4.25) below, and to prove Theorem 1.3. The crucial step is to prove Theorem 4.5 in Section 4.1 for the inner expansions defined by (4.1) in the sequel, which will be glued to the outer expansion in

(4.25). To this end, we shall first explicitely define $h_1, h_2, \hat{c}_2, \hat{c}_3$ in the inner expansions, while the technical calculations, which lead to this definitions, are done in the Appendix A.3. Then, in Lemma 4.1, Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.3, we prove the validity of these definitions and various estimates are given. In Lemma 4.4, a part of the error in convection term is treated carefully. In Lemma 4.7, we deal with estimates away from the interface, which is less subtle. For a first reading, the proofs of these technical lemmas can be skipped.

4.1 Inner Expansion

In this section we will construct the inner expansion of the approximate solution c_A with the aid of the following ansatz:

$$\begin{aligned} c^{in}(x,t) = \hat{c}^{in}(\rho,s,t) &= \theta_0(\rho) + \varepsilon^2 \hat{c}_2(\rho, S(x,t), t) + \varepsilon^3 \hat{c}_3(\rho, S(x,t), t) \\ &=: c_0^{in}(x,t) + \varepsilon^2 c_2^{in}(x,t) + \varepsilon^3 c_3^{in}(x,t) \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

where $s = S(x,t)$ and ρ is related to (x,t) by

$$\rho = \frac{d_\Gamma(x,t)}{\varepsilon} - h_1(S(x,t),t) - \varepsilon h_{2,\varepsilon}(S(x,t),t). \tag{4.2}$$

We note that in the functions which will be defined in the following, ρ is often an independent variable. But in the final definition of the approximate solutions ρ is related to (x,t) by (4.2). Here $\hat{c}_2, \hat{c}_3, h_1, h_{2,\varepsilon}$ are chosen as follows: We define $h_1 = h_1(s,t)$ as the solution of the following linear parabolic equation, coupled with (3.13), which determines $\mathbf{v}_1^\pm$:

$$D_t h_1 - X_0^*(\mathbf{v}) \cdot \nabla_\Gamma h_1 - \Delta_\Gamma h_1 - \kappa_1 h_1 + X_0^*(\mathrm{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\, \mathbf{v}) h_1 = X_0^*(\mathbf{v}_{1,\mathbf{n}}^\pm) \quad \text{on } \mathbb{T}^1 \times [0,T_0] \tag{4.3}$$

together with the initial data $h_1|_{t=0} = 0$, cf. Corollary 2.11. Note that here we use the notation (2.9) and $(\mathbf{v}, \Gamma)$ is the solution of (1.11)-(1.16). κ_1 is a curvature term defined in (2.15). Using h_1, we shall define $\hat{c}_2 = \hat{c}_2(\rho,s,t)$ as the bounded solution of the following ordinary differential equation:

$$\begin{aligned} &- \partial_\rho^2 \hat{c}_2(\rho,s,t) + f''(\theta_0(\rho)) \hat{c}_2(\rho,s,t) \\ &= |\nabla_\Gamma h_1(s,t)|^2 \theta_0''(\rho) - \rho \theta_0'(\rho)(\kappa_1(s,t) - (\mathrm{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\, \mathbf{v})(X_0(s,t),t)) \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

together with $\hat{c}_2(0,s,t) = 0$ for all $(\rho,s,t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^1 \times [0,T_0]$. For the following we denote

$$\begin{aligned} b(\rho,s,t) &:= \frac{1}{2}\left[(\partial_{\mathbf{n}}^2 \mathbf{v}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^+ + \partial_{\mathbf{n}}^2 \mathbf{v}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^-)(X_0(s,t),t) + (\partial_{\mathbf{n}}^2 \mathbf{v}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^+ - \partial_{\mathbf{n}}^2 \mathbf{v}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^-)(X_0(s,t),t)\eta(\rho)\right](\rho + h_1(s,t))^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\left[(\partial_{\mathbf{n}} \mathbf{v}_0^+ + \partial_{\mathbf{n}} \mathbf{v}_0^-)(X_0(s,t),t) + (\partial_{\mathbf{n}} \mathbf{v}_0^+ - \partial_{\mathbf{n}} \mathbf{v}_0^-)(X_0(s,t),t)\eta(\rho)\right] \cdot \nabla_\Gamma h_1(s,t)(\rho + h_1(s,t)) \\ &+ \mathbf{v}_1^\pm(X_0(s,t),t) \cdot \nabla_\Gamma h_1(s,t) - (\mathrm{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\, \mathbf{v}_1^\pm)(X_0(s,t),t) h_1(s,t) + \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}}(\rho, X_0(s,t),t), \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

where $\mathbf{v}_0^\pm = \mathbf{v}|_{\Omega^\pm}$ and extended smoothly to $\Omega \times [0,T_0]$ as before and $\mathbf{v}_1^\pm$ are determined by (3.13). Then b is a smooth function in (ρ,s,t), which is independent of $h_{2,\varepsilon}$ and satisfies

$$|(b, \partial_s b)| \le C(1 + |\rho|^2) \text{ for all } (\rho,s,t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^1 \times [0,T]. \tag{4.6}$$

Furthermore, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{D}_1(r,\rho,s,t) &= -2\nabla_\Gamma h_1(s,t) \cdot L^\nabla h_1(r,s,t) \theta_0''(\rho) - |L^\nabla h_1(r,s,t)|^2 \theta_0''(\rho) \\ &\quad + \theta_0'(\rho)\left[(L^\Delta h_1 - L^t h_1)(r,s,t) + \mathbf{v}(X_0(s,t),t) \cdot L^\nabla h_1(r,s,t)\right], \\ \mathfrak{D}(\rho,s,t) &= \partial_r \mathfrak{D}_1(0,\rho,s,t), \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

where $r \in (-3\delta, 3\delta)$, $s \in \mathbb{T}^1$, $t \in [0,T_0]$, and $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover,

$$\mathfrak{B}(s,t) := \frac{1}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} (\theta_0')^2 d\rho} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[(b(\rho,s,t) - \kappa_2(s,t)\rho^2)\theta_0'(\rho) + (\rho + h_1(s,t))\mathfrak{D}(\rho,s,t)\right] \theta_0'(\rho) \mathrm{d}\rho. \tag{4.8}$$

Now we define $h_2 = h_{2,\varepsilon}\colon \mathbb{T}^1 \times [0,T_0] \to \mathbb{R}$ as solution of the following parabolic equation

$$D_t h_2 - \Delta_\Gamma h_2 - \kappa_1 h_2 - X_0^*(\mathbf{v})\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_2 + X_0^*(\operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\mathbf{v})h_2 = \mathfrak{B} - \kappa_2 h_1^2 + X_0^*(\mathbf{n}\cdot\mathbf{w}_1) \tag{4.9}$$

on $\mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T_0]$ together with initial condition $h_2|_{t=0}=0$, where

$$\mathbf{w}_1 = \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_A - \mathbf{v}_A + \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1}{\varepsilon^2} \quad \text{with } \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1 \in L^\infty(0,T_0;H_0^1(\Omega)^2\cap L^2_\sigma(\Omega)) \tag{4.10}$$

is determined by (3.31)-(3.32) and $\mathbf{v}_A, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_A$ are as in the beginning of previous section. Finally, we shall define $\hat{c}_3 = \hat{c}_3(\rho,s,t)$ as the solution of

$$\begin{aligned}&\varepsilon^2(D_t\hat{c}_3 - \Delta_\Gamma\hat{c}_3) - \partial_\rho^2\hat{c}_3 + f''(\theta_0)\hat{c}_3\\ &= 2\nabla_\Gamma h_1\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_2\theta_0'' - \big(b - \mathfrak{B} - \kappa_2(\rho^2+2\rho h_1)\big)\theta_0' - (\rho+h_1)\mathfrak{D} \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T_0]\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

together with initial condition $\hat{c}_3|_{t=0}=0$.

The next lemma provides important estimates to treat remainder terms in the following.

Lemma 4.1 *The functions $h_1, \hat{c}_2, h_2, \hat{c}_3$ are well defined through the above formulae. For $\hat{c}_2$ we have*

$$\partial_\rho^i\partial_s^j\partial_t^k\hat{c}_2(\rho,S(x,t),t) \in \mathcal{R}_{0,\alpha}, \quad \forall i,j,k\geq 0. \tag{4.12}$$

Moreover, for $\hat{c}_3$ we have for every $k\in\mathbb{N}_0$, $\theta>0$, $\varepsilon\in(0,1)$ and $T_\varepsilon\in(0,T_0]$ that

$$\begin{aligned}&\varepsilon\|(\rho^k\hat{c}_3,\partial_s\hat{c}_3)\|_{L^\infty(0,T_\varepsilon;L^2(\mathbb{T}^1\times\mathbb{R}))}\\ &+\varepsilon^\theta\sup_{(s,t)\in\mathbb{T}^1\times(0,T_\varepsilon)}\|\hat{c}_3(\cdot,s,t)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} + \varepsilon^\theta\|\hat{c}_3\|_{L^\infty((0,T_\varepsilon)\times\mathbb{T}^1\times\mathbb{R})}\\ &+\|(\rho^k\hat{c}_3,\rho^k\partial_\rho\hat{c}_3,\partial_s\hat{c}_3,\partial_\rho^2\hat{c}_3,\partial_s\partial_\rho\hat{c}_3,\varepsilon\partial_s^2\hat{c}_3,\varepsilon\rho^k\partial_s\hat{c}_3)\|_{L^2((0,T_\varepsilon)\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1)} \leq C_{k,\theta}(1+\|h_\varepsilon\|_{X_{T_\varepsilon}}),\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

where $C_{k,\theta}$ is independent of $\varepsilon, T_\varepsilon$ and h_ε.

Proof: First of all, we will show that all terms are well-defined. Because of Corollary 2.11, h_1 can be uniquely determined by solving the coupled system involving (3.13) and (4.3) together with $h_1|_{t=0}=0$. Moreover, we can obtain $\hat{c}_2=\hat{c}_2(\rho,s,t)$ by solving (4.4) for every $s\in\mathbb{T}^1$, $t\in[0,T_0]$ using Proposition 2.3. Note that the compatibility condition (2.18) is fulfilled as

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{R}}\big(|\nabla_\Gamma h_1(s,t)|^2\theta_0''(\rho) - \theta_0'(\rho)\rho\left(\kappa_1(s,t) - (\operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\mathbf{v})(X_0(s,t))\right)\big)\theta_0'(\rho)\mathrm{d}\rho\\ &= |\nabla_\Gamma h_1(s,t)|^2\int_{\mathbb{R}}\theta_0''(\rho)\theta_0'(\rho)\mathrm{d}\rho - (\kappa_1(s,t) - (\operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\mathbf{v})(X_0(s,t)))\int_{\mathbb{R}}\rho(\theta_0'(\rho))^2\mathrm{d}\rho = 0,\end{aligned}$$

following from the fact that θ_0' is an even function and $\theta_0'(\rho)\to_{|\rho|\to\infty}0$.

This leads to a smooth function $\mathfrak{B}$ defined by (4.8). Moreover, according to (2.19) and Definition 2.5, we can use Proposition 2.3 to show (4.12), where $g^\pm=0$. The existence of a unique solution $h_2\in X_{T_0}$ of (4.9) is shown in the next lemma. Note that, as $\mathbf{w}_1$ depends on h_2, the equation for h_2 is non-linear.

Finally, we need to establish the estimate for $\hat{c}_3$ satisfying (4.11). In order to apply Theorem 2.12, we need to estimate

$$\tilde{g}(\rho,s,t) := 2\nabla_\Gamma h_1\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_2\theta_0''(\rho) - \big(b-\mathfrak{B}-\kappa_2(\rho^2+2\rho h_1)\big)\theta_0'(\rho) - (\rho+h_1)\mathfrak{D}(\rho,s,t).$$

We note that the compatibility condition (2.41) is fulfilled due to the definition of $\mathfrak{B}$. It follows from (4.6), (4.7), (4.8) and the decay estimate (1.19) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\varepsilon\|(\hat{c}_3,\partial_s\hat{c}_3)\|_{L^\infty(0,T_\varepsilon;L^2(\mathbb{T}^1\times\mathbb{R}))} + \|(\hat{c}_3,\partial_\rho\hat{c}_3,\partial_s\hat{c}_3,\partial_\rho^2\hat{c}_3,\partial_s\partial_\rho\hat{c}_3,\varepsilon\partial_s^2\hat{c}_3)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times(0,T_\varepsilon))}\\ &\leq C\|(\tilde{g},\partial_s\tilde{g},\partial_\rho\tilde{g})\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times(0,T_\varepsilon))} \leq C'(1+\|h_\varepsilon\|_{X_{T_\varepsilon}}).\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, using the exponential decay of $\theta_0'(\rho)$, $\theta_0''(\rho)$ and $\tilde{g}(\rho,s,t)$ as $\rho\to\infty$ and (2.43), it is easy to observe that for any $k\in\mathbb{N}$ there is a constant C_k independent of $\hat{c}_3,\varepsilon,h_\varepsilon$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\varepsilon\rho^k\hat{c}_3\|_{L^\infty(0,T_\varepsilon;L^2(\mathbb{T}^1\times\mathbb{R}))} + \|(\rho^k\hat{c}_3,\rho^k\partial_\rho\hat{c}_3)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times(0,T_\varepsilon))}\\ &\leq C\|(1+|\rho|)^k\tilde{g}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times(0,T_\varepsilon))} \leq C_k(1+\|h_\varepsilon\|_{X_{T_\varepsilon}}).\end{aligned}$$

The second and third estimate in (4.13) follows from (2.44) and the boundness of

$$h_{2,\varepsilon} \in X_{T_\varepsilon} \hookrightarrow BUC([0,T_\varepsilon]; H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^1)) \cap L^2(0,T_\varepsilon; H^{\frac{5}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^1)) \hookrightarrow L^{2p}(0,T_\varepsilon; C^1(\mathbb{T}^1))$$

for any $1 \le p < \infty$. ∎

In the last proof we used the following lemma which is concerned with the solvability of (4.9).

Lemma 4.2 *Let $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. Then there is a unique solution $h_{2,\varepsilon} \in X_{T_0}$ of (4.9), where $\mathbf{w}_1$ is determined by (4.10) with $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1$ being determined by (3.31)-(3.32). Moreover, there are some $\varepsilon_1 \in (0,1)$, $T_1 \le T_0$ and $M = M(R) > 0$, independent of ε, such that the solution h_ε satisfies (3.4) (for some $T_\varepsilon \in (0,T_0]$) if (3.39) is valid and $\varepsilon \le \varepsilon_1$, $T_\varepsilon \le T_1$.*

Proof: First of all, we note that $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1$ and therefore $\mathbf{w}_1$ depends on $h_{2,\varepsilon}$ since the definition of $c_{A,0}$ in (3.2) contains the term

$$\theta_0\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma(x,t)}{\varepsilon} - h_1(s,t) - \varepsilon h_{2,\varepsilon}(s,t)\right).$$

Using Theorem 2.9, one can reduce (4.9) to a fixed point equation

$$h_{2,\varepsilon} = S_T(h_{2,\varepsilon}) \qquad \text{in } X_T.$$

To solve it, one can first apply the contraction mapping principle to obtain a solution $h_{2,\varepsilon} \in X_T$ for some $T = T_\varepsilon \in (0,T_0]$. To this end one uses that for every $h_{2,\varepsilon} \in X_T$

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{0\le t\le T}\left|\varepsilon\int_\Omega \nabla(c_\varepsilon - c_{A,0}) \otimes (\nabla c_{A,0} - \mathbf{g}) : D\boldsymbol{\varphi}(x)\mathrm{d}x\right| \\ &\quad\le C(\varepsilon)\left(\sup_{0\le t\le T}\|h_{2,\varepsilon}(.,t)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^1)} + 1\right)\|\boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\end{aligned}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in H^1(\Omega)^2$ because of (2.26), (3.36), and since c_ε is a known smooth function. Therefore the $L^2(0,T;H^{1/2}(\mathbb{T}^1))$-norm of $X_0^*(\mathbf{n}\cdot\mathbf{w}_1)$ on the right-hand side of (4.9) can be estimated by

$$C'(\varepsilon)T^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\sup_{0\le t\le T}\|h_{2,\varepsilon}(.,t)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^1)} + 1\right). \tag{4.14}$$

Similarly one shows that the right-hand side is Lipschitz-continuous with respect to $h_{2,\varepsilon}$ with Lipschitz constant $C(\varepsilon)T^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Hence choosing $T = T'_\varepsilon \in (0,T_0]$ sufficiently small one obtains a contraction. Moreover, because of the linear growth of the bound in (4.14), there is an a priori bound of $\sup_{0\le t\le T'_\varepsilon}\|h_{2,\varepsilon}(\cdot,t)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^1)}$, which depends only on ε and T_0. Therefore the solution can be extended on $[0,T_0]$ to a unique solution $h_{2,\varepsilon} \in X_{T_0}$. The details are left to the reader.

Now we assume that (3.39) is valid for some $T_\varepsilon \in (0,T_0]$. In order to show the validity of (3.4), we use that

$$\|h_{2,\varepsilon}\|_{X_{T_\varepsilon}} \le C(1 + \|X_0^*(\mathbf{n}\cdot\mathbf{w}_1)\|_{L^2(0,T_\varepsilon;H^{1/2}(\mathbb{T}^1))})$$

because of Theorem 2.9. To estimate the right hand side of the above inequality, we use (4.10), Theorem 3.5 and Proposition 3.6 and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&C(1 + \|X_0^*(\mathbf{n}\cdot\mathbf{w}_1)\|_{L^2(0,T_\varepsilon;H^{1/2}(\mathbb{T}^1))}) \\ \le& C'(1 + \varepsilon^{-2}\|\mathbf{v}_A - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_A\|_{L^2(0,T_\varepsilon;H^1(\Omega))} + \varepsilon^{-2}\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1\|_{L^2(0,T_\varepsilon;H^1(\Omega))}) \le C(R) + C(M)(T^{1/4} + \varepsilon^{1/2})\end{aligned}$$

for some $C, C', C(R)$ independent of ε, T_ε, M, and $h_{2,\varepsilon}$ due to (3.40a) as long as $\varepsilon \le \min(\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_1)$, where ε_1 is as in Proposition 3.6 and depends on M. Note that $C(R)$ is independent of M. Now we choose $M = C(R)+1$ and $T_1 \in (0,T_0]$, $\varepsilon_1 \in (0,1]$ such that $C(M)(T^{\frac{1}{4}} + \varepsilon_1^{1/2}) \le 1$ and Proposition 3.6 can be applied. This determines ε_1 and T_1 and finishes the proof. ∎

The next lemma is concerned with the estimate of the inner expansion defined by (4.1).

Lemma 4.3 *Assume that* (3.4) *holds true for some* $M > 0$, $T_\varepsilon \in [0,T_0], \varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0]$, *and* $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1]$. *Then there is some* $C(M) > 0$ *independent of* T_ε, $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0]$, *and* $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1]$ *such that*

$$\varepsilon^2\|(c_2^{in}, \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} c_2^{in})\|_{L^\infty(0,T_\varepsilon;L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta)))} \le C(M)\varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}}, \qquad \varepsilon^2\|\partial_{\mathbf{n}} c_2^{in}\|_{L^\infty(0,T_\varepsilon;L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta)))} \le C(M)\varepsilon^{N-\frac{1}{2}}.$$
$$\varepsilon^3\|c_3^{in}\|_{L^\infty(0,T_\varepsilon;L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta)))} \le C(M,\theta)\varepsilon^{N+\frac{3}{2}-\theta}, \ \varepsilon^3\|\nabla c_3^{in}\|_{L^\infty(0,T_\varepsilon;L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta)))} \le C(M,\theta)\varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}-\theta},$$
$$\varepsilon^3\|\nabla c_3^{in}\|_{L^2(0,T_\varepsilon;L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta)))} \le C(M)\varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}}.$$

for any $\theta \in (0,1)$.

Proof: The estimates of c_2^{in} follow from (4.12), (2.17), and Lemma 2.6 in a straight-forward manner. Using Lemma 4.1 and the same change of variables as in the proof of Lemma 2.6, we conclude

$$\varepsilon^3\|c_3^{in}\|_{L^\infty(0,T_\varepsilon;L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta)))} \le C(M)\varepsilon^{3+\frac{1}{2}} \sup_{t\in[0,T_\varepsilon]} \|\hat{c}_3(\cdot,\cdot,t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^1\times\mathbb{R})} \le C'(M,\theta)\varepsilon^{3+\frac{1}{2}-\theta}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varepsilon^3\|\nabla c_3^{in}\|_{L^\infty(0,T_\varepsilon;L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta)))} \\
&\le C(M)\varepsilon^{3+\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\sup_{t\in[0,T_\varepsilon],s\in\mathbb{T}^1}\|\partial_\rho\hat{c}_3(\cdot,s,t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} + \|\partial_s\hat{c}_3\|_{L^\infty(0,T_\varepsilon;L^2(\mathbb{T}^1\times\mathbb{R}))}\right) \\
&\le C(M,\theta)\varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}-\theta}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we first applied (2.17) to $\hat{c}_3$ and then employed (4.13).

Finally, the last inequality follows from the boundedness of $h_2 \in X_T \hookrightarrow BUC([0,T_\varepsilon];W_4^1(\mathbb{T}^1))$, (2.17) and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varepsilon^3\|\nabla c_3^{in}\|_{L^2(0,T_\varepsilon;L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta)))} \\
&\le C(M)\varepsilon^{3+\frac{1}{2}}\left(\|(\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\partial_\rho\hat{c}_3, \partial_s\hat{c}_3)\|_{L^2((0,T_\varepsilon)\times\mathbb{T}^1\times\mathbb{R})} + \|\partial_\rho\hat{c}_3\|_{L^2((0,T_\varepsilon)\times\mathbb{R};L^4(\mathbb{T}^1))}\right) \le C(M)\varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

■

The following result gives an important expansion formula for the convection term. Recall that, L^∇ is defined by (2.10).

Lemma 4.4 *Let* $\mathbf{v}_A^{in}$ *be defined via* (3.7), (3.12)-(3.16) *and assume that* (3.4) *and* (3.39) *hold true. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{v}_A^{in}(\rho,x,t)\cdot\nabla c^{in}(x,t) = (\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{n}}|_\Gamma + \mathbf{v}_{1,\mathbf{n}}^{\pm}|_\Gamma)(x,t)\cdot\theta_0'(\rho) \\
&+ \Big(\mathbf{v}|_\Gamma\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_1 + \mathbf{v}|_\Gamma\cdot L^\nabla h_1 - (\mathrm{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\,\mathbf{v})|_\Gamma(\rho+h_1)\Big)(x,t)\theta_0'(\rho) + \varepsilon b(\rho,s,t)\theta_0'(\rho) \\
&+ \varepsilon\left(\mathbf{v}|_\Gamma\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_{2,\varepsilon} - \mathrm{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\,\mathbf{v}|_\Gamma h_{2,\varepsilon}\right)(x,t)\theta_0'(\rho) + \varepsilon\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{n}}|_\Gamma(x,t)\partial_\rho\hat{c}_2(\rho,s,t) + R_\varepsilon(x,t) \qquad (4.15)
\end{aligned}$$

in $\Gamma(3\delta)$, *where* $s = S(x,t)$, ρ *is as in* (4.2), *and* $b = b(\rho,s,t)$ *is defined in* (4.5). *Moreover,*

$$\|R_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(0,T_\varepsilon;L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta)))} \le C(R,M)\varepsilon^{N+1/2} \qquad \text{for all } \varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0],$$

where $C(R,M)$ *is independent of* $T_\varepsilon, \varepsilon$, *and* ε_0.

Proof: In the proof, all identities should be interpreted in terms of the variable x instead of the surface coordinate $s \in \mathbb{T}^1$. For example, according to our definition, the function $\nabla_\Gamma h_2 = (\nabla_\Gamma h_2)(s,t)$ with $s \in \mathbb{T}^1$, is a function defined on the chart of the interface. However, in this proof, it is understood as $\nabla_\Gamma h_2 = (\nabla_\Gamma h_2)(S(x,t),t)$. Similarly, $\mathbf{v}|_\Gamma$ is the restriction of $\mathbf{v}$ on the interface Γ. However, it should be understood via $\mathbf{v}|_\Gamma = \mathbf{v}(P_{\Gamma_t}(x),t)$, as a function of x. In the sequel the dependence on variables (x,t) is emphasised occasionally for clarity.

In the following R_ε will denote any term such that $\|R_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Gamma(2\delta)\cap(\Omega\times(0,T_\varepsilon)))} \le C\varepsilon^{N+1/2}$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0]$ and for some $C>0$, which depends only on the quantity M in (3.4), R in (3.39), $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_1$, and Γ. We use that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbf{v}_A^{in}(\rho,x,t)\cdot\nabla c_0^{in}(x,t) = \\ &\mathbf{v}_A^{in}\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon(S(x,t),t),x,t\right)\cdot\left(\tfrac{\mathbf{n}_{\Gamma_t}(x)}{\varepsilon} - (\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon)(d_\Gamma,S(x,t),t)\right)\theta_0'\left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon(S(x,t),t)\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $d_\Gamma = d_\Gamma(x,t)$. Furthermore, we have $\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{v}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^{\pm}|_\Gamma = -\operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\mathbf{v}_0^{\pm}|_\Gamma$, $\mathbf{v}_0^{\pm}|_\Gamma = \mathbf{v}|_\Gamma$ and therefore $\operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\mathbf{v}_0^{\pm}|_\Gamma = \operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\mathbf{v}|_\Gamma$. Thus a Taylor expansion of $\mathbf{v}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^{\pm}$ in terms of distance function $r = d_\Gamma(x,t)$ gives

$$\mathbf{v}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^{\pm}(x,t) = \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{n}}|_\Gamma(x,t) - \operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\mathbf{v}|_\Gamma(x,t)d_\Gamma(x,t) + \partial_{\mathbf{n}}^2\mathbf{v}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^{\pm}|_\Gamma(x,t)\tfrac{d_\Gamma(x,t)^2}{2} + r^{\pm}(x,t)d_\Gamma(x,t)^3,$$

where the remainder $r^{\pm}$ satisfies

$$\sup_{(x,t)\in\Gamma(3\delta)}|r^{\pm}(x,t)| \le C. \tag{4.16}$$

On the other hand, it follows from (3.10) and (3.12) that,

$$\mathbf{v}_0(\rho,x,t) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{v}_0^+(x,t)+\mathbf{v}_0^-(x,t)) + \frac{\eta(\rho)}{2}(\mathbf{v}_0^+(x,t)-\mathbf{v}_0^-(x,t)). \tag{4.17}$$

Combining the above two identities leads to

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\mathbf{v}_0(\rho,x,t)\cdot\mathbf{n}(s,t)\\ &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{n}}|_\Gamma(x,t) - \operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\mathbf{v}|_\Gamma(x,t)(\rho+h_1(s,t)+\varepsilon h_{2,\varepsilon}(s,t))\\ &\quad+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}(\partial_{\mathbf{n}}^2\mathbf{v}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^+|_\Gamma + \partial_{\mathbf{n}}^2\mathbf{v}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^-|_\Gamma)(x,t)(\rho+h_1(s,t)+\varepsilon h_{2,\varepsilon}(s,t))^2\\ &\quad+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}(\partial_{\mathbf{n}}^2\mathbf{v}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^+|_\Gamma - \partial_{\mathbf{n}}^2\mathbf{v}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^-|_\Gamma)(x,t)\eta(\rho)(\rho+h_1(s,t)+\varepsilon h_{2,\varepsilon}(s,t))^2\\ &\quad+\varepsilon^2\left(\frac{r^+(x,t)+r^-(x,t)}{2}+\frac{r^+(x,t)-r^-(x,t)}{2}\eta(\rho)\right)(\rho+h_1(s,t)+\varepsilon h_{2,\varepsilon}(s,t))^3\end{aligned}$$

where $s = S(x,t)$ and ρ is defined via (4.2). Lemma 2.6 implies that the terms in the last line of the above identity give a contribution to R_ε after multiplication with $\theta_0'(\frac{d_\Gamma(x,t)}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon(s,t))$. Moreover, one can replace $(\rho+h_1(s,t)+\varepsilon h_{2,\varepsilon}(s,t))$ by $(\rho+h_1(s,t))$ in all terms except the second since the remainders give another contribution to R_ε. As a result

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\mathbf{v}_0(\rho,x,t)\cdot\mathbf{n}(s,t)\theta_0'(\tfrac{d_\Gamma(x,t)}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon(s,t))\\ &= \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{n}}|_\Gamma(x,t) - \operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\mathbf{v}|_\Gamma(x,t)(\rho+h_\varepsilon)\right)\theta_0'(\rho) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(\partial_{\mathbf{n}}^2\mathbf{v}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^+|_\Gamma + \partial_{\mathbf{n}}^2\mathbf{v}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^-|_\Gamma)(x,t)(\rho+h_1)^2\theta_0'(\rho)\\ &\quad+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}(\partial_{\mathbf{n}}^2\mathbf{v}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^+|_\Gamma - \partial_{\mathbf{n}}^2\mathbf{v}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^-|_\Gamma)(x,t)\eta(\rho)(\rho+h_1)^2\theta_0'(\rho) + R_\varepsilon\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, a Taylor expansion of $\mathbf{v}_0^{\pm}$ near the interface is given by

$$\mathbf{v}_0^{\pm}(x,t) = \mathbf{v}|_\Gamma(x,t) + \partial_{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{v}_0^{\pm}|_\Gamma(x,t)d_\Gamma(x,t) + \tilde{r}^{\pm}(x,t)d_\Gamma(x,t)^2,$$

where $\sup_{(x,t)\in\Gamma(3\delta)}|\tilde{r}^{\pm}(x,t)| \le C$. This together with (4.17) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbf{v}_0(\rho,x,t)\cdot(\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon)(d_\Gamma(x,t),S(x,t),t)\\ &= \mathbf{v}|_\Gamma\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_1 + \mathbf{v}|_\Gamma\cdot(L^\nabla h_1)(d_\Gamma,s,t) + \varepsilon\mathbf{v}|_\Gamma\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_{2,\varepsilon} + \varepsilon\mathbf{v}|_\Gamma\cdot(L^\nabla h_{2,\varepsilon})(d_\Gamma,s,t)\\ &\quad+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\left[(\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{v}_0^+|_\Gamma+\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{v}_0^-|_\Gamma) + (\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{v}_0^+|_\Gamma - \partial_{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{v}_0^-|_\Gamma)\eta(\rho)\right]\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_1(s,t)(\rho+h_1+\varepsilon h_{2,\varepsilon})\\ &\quad+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\left[(\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{v}_0^+|_\Gamma+\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{v}_0^-|_\Gamma) + (\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{v}_0^+|_\Gamma - \partial_{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{v}_0^-|_\Gamma)\eta(\rho)\right]\cdot L^\nabla h_1(d_\Gamma,s,t)(\rho+h_1+\varepsilon h_{2,\varepsilon})\\ &\quad+\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\left[(\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{v}_0^+|_\Gamma+\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{v}_0^-|_\Gamma) + (\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{v}_0^+|_\Gamma - \partial_{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{v}_0^-|_\Gamma)\eta(\rho)\right]\cdot(\nabla^\Gamma h_{2,\varepsilon})(d_\Gamma,s,t)(\rho+h_1+\varepsilon h_{2,\varepsilon})\\ &\quad+\varepsilon^2\left(\frac{\tilde{r}^+(x,t)+\tilde{r}^-(x,t)}{2}+\frac{\tilde{r}^+(x,t)-\tilde{r}^-(x,t)}{2}\eta(\rho)\right)\cdot(\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon)(d_\Gamma,s,t)(\rho+h_1+\varepsilon h_{2,\varepsilon})^2.\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 2.6 and $L^\nabla h_1|_\Gamma \equiv 0$, it is easy to observe that the last three terms give rise to terms R_ε after multiplication with $\theta_0'(\frac{d_\Gamma(x,t)}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon(s,t))$. Hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{v}_0(\rho,x,t)\cdot\nabla c_0^{in}(x,t)\\
&= \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\mathbf{v}_\mathbf{n}|_\Gamma\theta_0'(\rho) + \Big(\mathbf{v}|_\Gamma\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_1 + \mathbf{v}|_\Gamma\cdot L^\nabla h_1(d_\Gamma,s,t) - \operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol\tau}\mathbf{v}|_\Gamma(\rho+h_1)\Big)\theta_0'(\rho)\\
&\quad + \varepsilon(\mathbf{v}|_\Gamma\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_{2,\varepsilon} - \operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol\tau}\mathbf{v}|_\Gamma h_{2,\varepsilon})\theta_0'(\rho)\\
&\quad + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(\partial_\mathbf{n}^2\mathbf{v}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^+|_\Gamma + \partial_\mathbf{n}^2\mathbf{v}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^-|_\Gamma)(\rho+h_1)^2\theta_0'(\rho) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(\partial_\mathbf{n}^2\mathbf{v}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^+|_\Gamma - \partial_\mathbf{n}^2\mathbf{v}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^-|_\Gamma)\eta(\rho)(\rho+h_1)^2\theta_0'(\rho)\\
&\quad + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\big(\big(\partial_\mathbf{n}\mathbf{v}_0^+|_\Gamma + \partial_\mathbf{n}\mathbf{v}_0^-|_\Gamma\big) + (\partial_\mathbf{n}\mathbf{v}_0^+|_\Gamma - \partial_\mathbf{n}\mathbf{v}_0^-|_\Gamma)\eta(\rho)\big)\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_1(\rho+h_1)\theta_0'(\rho) + R_\varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varepsilon\mathbf{v}_1(\rho,x,t)\cdot\nabla c_0^{in}(x,t)\\
&= \mathbf{v}_{1,\mathbf{n}}^\pm|_\Gamma\theta_0'(\rho) + \varepsilon\Big(\mathbf{v}_1^\pm|_\Gamma\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_1 + \mathbf{v}_1^\pm|_\Gamma\cdot L^\nabla h_1(d_\Gamma,s,t) - \operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol\tau}\mathbf{v}_1^\pm|_\Gamma h_1\Big)\theta_0'(\rho)\\
&\quad + \varepsilon^2(\mathbf{v}_1^\pm|_\Gamma\cdot\nabla^\Gamma h_{2,\varepsilon}(d_\Gamma,s,t) - \operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol\tau}\mathbf{v}_1^\pm|_\Gamma h_{2,\varepsilon})\theta_0'(\rho)\\
&\quad + \varepsilon^2\left(\frac{r_{1,\mathbf{n}}^+ + r_{1,\mathbf{n}}^-}{2} + \frac{r_{1,\mathbf{n}}^+ - r_{1,\mathbf{n}}^-}{2}\eta(\rho)\right)(\rho+h_\varepsilon)^2\theta_0'(\rho)\\
&\quad + \varepsilon^2\left(\frac{\tilde r_1^+ + \tilde r_1^-}{2} + \frac{\tilde r_1^+ - \tilde r_1^-}{2}\eta(\rho)\right)\cdot\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon(d_\Gamma,s,t)(\rho+h_\varepsilon)\theta_0'(\rho)\\
&= \mathbf{v}_{1,\mathbf{n}}^\pm|_\Gamma\theta_0'(\rho) + \varepsilon\big(\mathbf{v}_1^\pm|_\Gamma\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_1 - \operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol\tau}\mathbf{v}_1^\pm|_\Gamma h_1\big)\theta_0'(\rho) + R_\varepsilon
\end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varepsilon^2\mathbf{v}_2(\rho,x,t)\cdot\nabla c_0^{in}(x,t) = \varepsilon\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}}(\rho,P_{\Gamma_t}(x),t)\theta_0'(\rho) - \varepsilon^2\mathbf{v}_2(\rho,x,t)\cdot(\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon)(d_\Gamma,s,t)\theta_0'(\rho)\\
&\quad + \varepsilon^2\left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}}(\rho,x,t) - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}}(\rho,P_{\Gamma_t}(x),t)}{d_\Gamma} + \eta(\rho)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}}(x,t)\right)(\rho+h_\varepsilon)\theta_0'(\rho)\\
&= \varepsilon\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}}(\rho,X_0(s,t),t)\theta_0'(\rho) + R_\varepsilon
\end{aligned}$$

because of (3.15), (3.16), $\operatorname{div}\mathbf{v}_1^\pm = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{v}_{1,\mathbf{n}}^\pm(x,t) &= \mathbf{v}_{1,\mathbf{n}}(s,t) - \operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol\tau}\mathbf{v}_1(s,t)d_\Gamma(x,t) + r_{1,\mathbf{n}}^\pm(x,t)d_\Gamma(x,t)^2,\\
\mathbf{v}_1^\pm(x,t) &= \mathbf{v}_1(s,t) + \tilde r_1^\pm(x,t)d_\Gamma(x,t),
\end{aligned}$$

where $r_{1,\mathbf{n}}^\pm$ and $\tilde r_1^\pm$ satisfy the same estimate as $r^\pm$ in (4.16). Finally, with the aid of Lemma 2.6 it is easy to show that

$$\mathbf{v}_A(x,t)\cdot\varepsilon^2\nabla c_2^{in}(x,t) = \varepsilon\mathbf{v}_\mathbf{n}|_\Gamma(x,t)\partial_\rho\hat c_2(\rho,S(x,t),t) + R_\varepsilon(x,t),$$

and Lemma 4.3 yields $\mathbf{v}_A(x,t)\cdot\varepsilon^3\nabla c_3^{in}(\rho,S(x,t),t) = R_\varepsilon(x,t)$. Hence the statement of the lemma follows if b is defined as in (4.5). ∎

THEOREM 4.5 *Let $\mathbf{v}_A^{in}$ be defined via* (3.7) *and assume that* (3.4) *and* (3.39) *hold true. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t c^{in}(x,t) + \mathbf{v}_A^{in}(\rho,x,t)\cdot\nabla c^{in}(x,t) + \varepsilon^2\mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma(x,t)\cdot\nabla c_0^{in}(x,t) - \Delta c^{in}(x,t) + \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon^2}f'(c^{in})\\
&\quad = \mathfrak{C}(x,t) \qquad \text{for all } (x,t)\in\Gamma(2\delta),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

where

$$\int_0^T \|\mathfrak{C}(.,t)\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\,\mathrm{d}t \le C(M,R,T,\varepsilon)\varepsilon^{N+\frac12} \qquad \text{for all } T\in(0,T_\varepsilon], \varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0) \tag{4.19}$$

for some $C(M,R,T,\varepsilon)$ independent of $(T_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0)}$, $\varepsilon_0\in(0,1]$ such that $C(M,R,T,\varepsilon)\to_{(T,\varepsilon)\to 0}$ 0.

Proof: In the Appendix A.3 it is shown by careful, but lengthy calculations (see equation (A.74)) that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{C}(x,t) = R_\varepsilon(x,t) + \sum_{k=2}^{5} \varepsilon^k \mathfrak{R}_k(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon(S(x,t),t), S(x,t), t) \\ + \mathfrak{R}_1(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon(S(x,t),t), S(x,t), t) + \mathfrak{R}(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon(S(x,t),t), S(x,t), t) \qquad (4.20)\end{aligned}$$

where $R_\varepsilon(x,t)$ is defined as in Lemma 4.4 and $b = b(\rho,s,t)$ is defined in (4.5). Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{R} :=& -\varepsilon^2\kappa_{3,\varepsilon}\theta_0' - \varepsilon^2\kappa_2(2(\rho+h_1)h_2 + \varepsilon h_2^2)\theta_0' + \varepsilon^2\widehat{\mathfrak{D}}_\varepsilon + \varepsilon(L^\Delta - L^t)h_2\theta_0' \\ & - 2\varepsilon\theta_0''(\nabla_\Gamma h_1 \cdot L^\nabla h_2 + L^\Delta h_1 \cdot \nabla_\Gamma h_2 + L^\nabla h_1 \cdot L^\nabla h_2) \\ & + \varepsilon^2\left((\rho+h_\varepsilon)\kappa_1(s,t) - \varepsilon\kappa_2(\rho+h_\varepsilon)^2 - \varepsilon^2\kappa_{3,\varepsilon}(\rho,s,t)\right)\partial_\rho\hat{c}_2, \\ \mathfrak{R}_1 :=& \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} f'''\big(\theta_0(\rho) + \xi(\rho,s,t)(\varepsilon^2\hat{c}_2 + \varepsilon^3\hat{c}_3)(\rho,s,t)\big)\left(\hat{c}_2(\rho,s,t) + \varepsilon\hat{c}_3(\rho,s,t)\right)^2, \\ \mathfrak{R}_2 :=& \partial_t^\Gamma\hat{c}_2 - \Delta^\Gamma\hat{c}_2 + 2\nabla^\Gamma h_1\cdot\nabla^\Gamma\partial_\rho\hat{c}_2 - (\partial_t^\Gamma h_1 - \Delta^\Gamma h_1)\partial_\rho\hat{c}_2 - \nabla^\Gamma h_1\cdot\mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma\theta_0' \\ & - |\nabla^\Gamma h_1|^2\partial_\rho^2\hat{c}_2 - |\nabla^\Gamma h_2|^2\theta_0'' - \partial_\rho\hat{c}_3(V + \Delta d_\Gamma), \\ \mathfrak{R}_3 :=& 2\nabla^\Gamma h_2\cdot\nabla^\Gamma\partial_\rho\hat{c}_2 + 2\nabla^\Gamma h_1\cdot\nabla^\Gamma\partial_\rho\hat{c}_3 - (\partial_t^\Gamma h_2 - \Delta^\Gamma h_2)\partial_\rho\hat{c}_2 + (L^t - L^\Delta)\hat{c}_3 \\ & - 2\nabla^\Gamma h_1\cdot\nabla^\Gamma h_2\partial_\rho^2\hat{c}_2 - |\nabla^\Gamma h_1|^2\partial_\rho^2\hat{c}_3 - (\partial_t^\Gamma h_1 - \Delta^\Gamma h_1)\partial_\rho\hat{c}_3 - \nabla^\Gamma h_2\cdot\mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma\theta_0', \\ \mathfrak{R}_4 :=& 2\nabla^\Gamma h_2\cdot\nabla^\Gamma\partial_\rho\hat{c}_3 - (\partial_t^\Gamma h_2 - \Delta^\Gamma h_2)\partial_\rho\hat{c}_3 - |\nabla^\Gamma h_2|^2\partial_\rho^2\hat{c}_2 - 2\nabla^\Gamma h_1\cdot\nabla^\Gamma h_2\partial_\rho^2\hat{c}_3, \\ \mathfrak{R}_5 :=& -|\nabla^\Gamma h_2|^2\partial_\rho^2\hat{c}_3,\end{aligned}$$

where ξ is some function with $|\xi(\rho,s,t)| \le 1$, $\widehat{\mathfrak{D}}_\varepsilon$ is as in (A.65) below, and $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_{3,\varepsilon}$ are defined by (2.15). We recall that $\kappa_1(s,t)$ and $\kappa_2(s,t)$ are smooth and ε-independent functions while the estimate of $\kappa_{3,\varepsilon}$ is given by (2.16):

$$|\kappa_{3,\varepsilon}(\rho,s,t)| \le C|\rho + h_\varepsilon(s,t)|^3 \qquad \text{for all } \rho\in\mathbb{R}, s\in\mathbb{T}^1, t\in[0,T_0]. \qquad (4.21)$$

In order to prove (4.19) we estimate $\mathfrak{R}$ and $\mathfrak{R}_k, k = 1,\dots,5$ individually.

To $\mathfrak{R}$: By the Definition 2.5 and (2.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\varepsilon(L^\Delta h_2 - L^t h_2)(d_\Gamma(x,t), S(x,t), t)\theta_0'(\rho) \\ &- 2\varepsilon\theta_0''(\rho)\left(\nabla_\Gamma h_1\cdot L^\nabla h_2 + L^\Delta h_1\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_2 + L^\nabla h_1\cdot L^\nabla h_2\right)(d_\Gamma(x,t), S(x,t), t) \\ &= a_1(\rho,x,t)\partial_s h_2 + a_2(\rho,x,t)\partial_s^2 h_2,\end{aligned}$$

where $a_1, a_2 \in \mathcal{R}^0_{1,\alpha}$. So we can apply Corollary 2.7 to deduce

$$\int_0^T \|\varepsilon(L^\Delta h_2 - L^t h_2)\theta_0'(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon)\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\mathrm{d}t \le C(M)T^{\frac12}\varepsilon^{N+\frac12}$$

and

$$\int_0^T \left\|2\varepsilon\theta_0''(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon)(\nabla_\Gamma h_1\cdot L^\nabla h_2 + L^\Delta h_1\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_2 + L^\nabla h_1\cdot L^\nabla h_2)\right\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\mathrm{d}t \le C(M)T^{\frac12}\varepsilon^{N+\frac12}$$

for all $T\in(0,T_\varepsilon]$, $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0]$. All the rest terms in $\mathfrak{R}$ are multiplied by ε^2, depend only on $h_2(s,t)$ (and not on its derivatives), have exponential decay as $|\rho|\to\infty$ uniformly in $(s,t),\varepsilon$, and can be estimated with the help of Lemma 2.6 because of $X_T \hookrightarrow C^0(\Omega\times[0,T])$ and (A.66). So all these estimates together imply

$$\int_0^T \|\mathfrak{R}(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon(S(\cdot),t), S(\cdot),t)\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta)))}\mathrm{d}t \le C(M,\varepsilon,T)\varepsilon^{N+\frac12},$$

where $C(M,\varepsilon,T)\to_{(\varepsilon,T)\to0} 0$.

To $\mathfrak{R}_1$: First of all, because of (4.13), $\varepsilon\|\hat{c}_3\|_{L^\infty((0,T_\varepsilon)\times\mathbb{T}^1\times\mathbb{R})}$ is bounded. Therefore there is some $C>0$ such that

$$|\mathfrak{R}_1(\rho,s,t)| \le C\varepsilon^2|\hat{c}_2(\rho,s,t)+\varepsilon\hat{c}_3(\rho,s,t)|^2 \qquad \text{for all } \rho\in\mathbb{R}, s\in\mathbb{T}^1, t\in[0,T_0].$$

Hence, using a change of variable, (4.12), and (4.13) again, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^T \|\mathfrak{R}_1(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon(\cdot,t),\cdot,t)\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\mathrm{d}t \le C\varepsilon^{2+\frac12}\|(\hat{c}_2+\varepsilon\hat{c}_3)^2\|_{L^1(0,T;L^2(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1))}\\ &\le C\varepsilon^{N+\frac12}\left(T+\|\varepsilon\hat{c}_3\|_{L^1(0,T;L^2(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1))}+\|\varepsilon\hat{c}_3\|^2_{L^2(0,T;L^4(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1))}\right)\le C(M)(T+\varepsilon)\varepsilon^{N+\frac12}\end{aligned}$$

for all $T\in(0,T_\varepsilon]$, $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0]$.

To $\mathfrak{R}_2$: Using (4.12) and the smoothness of h_1, we can show that all the terms in $\mathfrak{R}_2$ that are related to $\hat{c}_2$ belong to $\mathcal{R}_{0,\alpha}$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{R}_{0,\alpha}\ni\mathfrak{R}_2(\rho,s,t)+|\nabla^\Gamma h_2|^2\theta_0''(\rho)+\nabla^\Gamma h_1\theta_0'\cdot\mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma+(V+\Delta d_\Gamma)\partial_\rho\hat{c}_3(\rho,s,t).$$

It remains to estimate the last three terms on the right hand side. A change of variable together with (4.13) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^T\|(V+\Delta d_\Gamma)\partial_\rho\hat{c}_3(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon(S(\cdot),t),S(\cdot),t)\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\mathrm{d}t\\ &\le CT^{\frac12}\sqrt{\varepsilon}\|\partial_\rho\hat{c}_3\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times(0,T'))}\le C'T^{\frac12}\sqrt{\varepsilon}\end{aligned}$$

for all $T\in(0,T_\varepsilon]$, $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0]$. The estimate for $|\nabla^\Gamma h_2|^2\theta_0''(\rho)$ follows from (3.4) and (2.8) together with Corollary 2.7:

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^T\left\||\nabla^\Gamma h_2|^2\theta_0''(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon(S(\cdot,t),t))\right\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\mathrm{d}t\\ &\le C\int_0^T\left\||\partial_s h_2(S(\cdot,t),t)|^2\theta_0''(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon(S(\cdot,t),t))\right\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta)))}\mathrm{d}t\\ &\le C\sqrt{\varepsilon}\int_0^T\|\partial_s h_2\|^2_{L^4(\mathbb{T}^1)}dt\le CT\varepsilon^{\frac12}\|h_2\|^2_{X_T}\end{aligned}$$

for all $T\in(0,T_\varepsilon]$, $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0]$. Similarly, it follows from the smoothness of h_1, Corollary 2.7 and trace estimate that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^T\left\|\nabla^\Gamma h_1\theta_0'\cdot\mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma\right\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\mathrm{d}t\le C\int_0^T\left\|\theta_0'\cdot\mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma\right\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\mathrm{d}t\\ &\le C\sqrt{\varepsilon}\int_0^T\|\mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t)}\,\mathrm{d}t\le C\sqrt{T\varepsilon}\,\|\mathbf{w}_1\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))}\end{aligned}$$

Since we assume (3.4) and (3.39), Proposition 3.6 and Theorem 3.5 are applicable. These together with (4.10) imply the estimate of $\mathbf{w}_1$

$$\|\mathbf{w}_1\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))}\le\varepsilon^{-2}\left(C(R)\varepsilon^N+C(M)(T^{\frac14}+\varepsilon^{\frac12})\varepsilon^N\right)=C(R)+C(M)(T^{\frac14}+\varepsilon^{\frac12}) \quad (4.22)$$

for all $T\in(0,T_\varepsilon]$, $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0]$. The above two estimates together imply the estimate for $\mathfrak{R}_2$.

To $\mathfrak{R}_3$: We rearrange the terms of $\mathfrak{R}_3$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{R}_3=&\overbrace{2\nabla^\Gamma h_2\cdot\nabla^\Gamma\partial_\rho\hat{c}_2+\Delta^\Gamma h_2\partial_\rho\hat{c}_2-2\nabla^\Gamma h_1\cdot\nabla^\Gamma h_2\partial_\rho^2\hat{c}_2-\partial_\rho\hat{c}_2\partial_t^\Gamma h_2}^{=:\mathfrak{R}_3'}-\nabla^\Gamma h_2\cdot\mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma\theta_0'\\ &\underbrace{+2\nabla^\Gamma h_1\cdot\nabla^\Gamma\partial_\rho\hat{c}_3+\Delta^\Gamma h_1\partial_\rho\hat{c}_3-|\nabla^\Gamma h_1|^2\partial_\rho^2\hat{c}_3-\partial_t^\Gamma h_1\partial_\rho\hat{c}_3+(L^t-L^\Delta)\hat{c}_3}_{=:\mathfrak{R}_3''}.\end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

The common feature of terms in $\mathfrak{R}_3'$ is that derivatives of h_2 are only multiplied with derivatives of $\hat{c}_2$ but not that of $\hat{c}_3$. So they can be estimated by

$$\int_0^T \|\varepsilon^3 \mathfrak{R}_3'(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon(\cdot,t),\cdot,t)\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\mathrm{d}t \le C\varepsilon^{3+\frac{1}{2}} T^{\frac{1}{2}} \|h_2\|_{X_T} \le C(M)\varepsilon^{N+\frac{3}{2}},$$

for all $T \in (0, T_\varepsilon]$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$. Moreover, $\mathfrak{R}_3''$ consists of terms that includes derivatives of $\hat{c}_3$. Note that every terms here is multiplied by derivatives of smooth and ε-independent functions and according to (2.10), $L^t - L^\Delta$ is a second order operator with coefficients vanishing on Γ. They can be estimated using (4.13):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T \|\varepsilon^3 \mathfrak{R}_3''(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon(\cdot,t),\cdot,t)\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta)))}\mathrm{d}t \\
&\le C(M)\varepsilon^{3+\frac{1}{2}} T^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(\partial_\rho \hat{c}_3, \partial_\rho^2 \hat{c}_3, \partial_s \partial_\rho \hat{c}_3, \partial_s \hat{c}_3, \partial_s^2 \hat{c}_3)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times(0,T_\varepsilon))} \le C(M)\varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}} T^{\frac{1}{2}}
\end{aligned}$$

for all $T \in (0, T_\varepsilon]$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$. Finally, the estimate of the last summand in (4.23) follows from Corollary 2.7,

$$\|fg\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^1)} \le C\|f\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{T}^1)} \|g\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{T}^1)} \quad \text{for all } f, g \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^1) \tag{4.24}$$

and (4.22) successively:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T \varepsilon^3 \|\nabla^\Gamma h_2 \cdot \mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma \theta_0'(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon(\cdot,t))\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta)))}\mathrm{d}t \\
&\le C\int_0^T \varepsilon^{3+\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_s h_2(S(\cdot,t),t)\cdot \mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t)}\mathrm{d}t \\
&\le C\varepsilon^{3+\frac{1}{2}} T^{\frac{1}{2}} \|h_2\|_{BUC([0,T_\varepsilon];H^{3/2}(\mathbb{T}^1))} \|X_0^*(\mathbf{w}_1)\|_{L^2(0,T;H^{1/2}(\mathbb{T}^1))} \le C(M,R)\varepsilon^{N+\frac{3}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

To $\mathfrak{R}_4$: For the first term in $\mathfrak{R}_4$, we use that

$$\sup_{r\in(-2\delta,2\delta)} \|\nabla^\Gamma h_2(r,\cdot,t)\cdot\nabla^\Gamma \partial_\rho \hat{c}_3(r,\cdot,\cdot,t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^1\times\mathbb{R})} \le C\|\partial_s h_2(t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^1)} \|\partial_s\partial_\rho \hat{c}_3(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^1\times\mathbb{R})}$$

for almost every $t \in [0,T]$ and $X_T \hookrightarrow L^4(0,T;C^1(\mathbb{T}^1))$. Therefore it follows from (4.13) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varepsilon^4 \int_0^T \|\nabla^\Gamma h_2(d_\Gamma,\cdot,t)\cdot\nabla^\Gamma \partial_\rho \hat{c}_3(d_\Gamma, \tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon,\cdot,t)\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\mathrm{d}t \\
&\le C\varepsilon^{4+\frac{1}{2}} T^{\frac{1}{4}} \|h_2\|_{X_{T_\varepsilon}} \|\partial_s\partial_\rho \hat{c}_3\|_{L^2((0,T_\varepsilon)\times\mathbb{T}^1\times\mathbb{R})} \le C(M)\varepsilon^{4+\frac{1}{2}}
\end{aligned}$$

for all $T \in (0, T_\varepsilon]$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$. For the second term in $\mathfrak{R}_4$, we apply (4.24), Hölder's inequality, and Sobolev interpolation inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{r\in(-2\delta,2\delta)} \|(\partial_t^\Gamma - \Delta^\Gamma) h_2(r,\cdot,t)\partial_\rho \hat{c}_3(\rho,\cdot,t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^1)} \\
&\le C(\|h_2\|_{H^{5/2}(\mathbb{T}^1)} + \|\partial_t h_2\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{T}^1)})\|\partial_\rho \hat{c}_3(\rho,\cdot,t)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^1)}
\end{aligned}$$

for almost every $t \in [0, T_\varepsilon]$. This together with a change of variable and (4.13) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varepsilon^4 \int_0^T \|(\partial_t^\Gamma - \Delta^\Gamma) h_2 \partial_\rho \hat{c}_3(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon,\cdot,t)\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\mathrm{d}t \\
&\le C\varepsilon^{4+\frac{1}{2}}(\|h_2\|_{L^2(0,T;H^{5/2}(\mathbb{T}^1))} + \|\partial_t h_2\|_{L^2(0,T;H^{1/2}(\mathbb{T}^1))})\|\partial_\rho \hat{c}_3\|_{L^2((0,T_\varepsilon)\times\mathbb{R};H^1(\mathbb{T}^1))} \le C(M)\varepsilon^{N+\frac{5}{2}}
\end{aligned}$$

for all $T \in (0, T_\varepsilon]$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$. The remaining terms can be treated in a similar manner and finally we get

$$\varepsilon^4 \|\mathfrak{R}_4\|_{L^1(0,T;L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta)))} = o(\varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}}) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

To $\mathfrak{R}_5$: It follows from (3.4) and Sobolev imbedding that $\|h_2\|_{L^4(0,T_\varepsilon;C^1(\mathbb{T}^1))}$ is uniformly bounded in ε. So we can show similarly as before that

$$\varepsilon^5 \int_0^T \left\| |\nabla^\Gamma h_2|^2 \partial_\rho^2 \hat{c}_3(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon,\cdot,t)\right\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta)))} \mathrm{d}t \le C(M)\varepsilon^{5+\frac{1}{2}}$$

for all $T \in (0, T_\varepsilon), \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$. ∎

4.2 The Full Expansion

In this subsection, we shall use the shorter notation $\chi_\pm := \chi_{\Omega^\pm(t)}$. After determination of the inner expansion, we define the approximate solutions c_A in $\Omega \times [0, T_0]$ as

$$\begin{aligned} c_A(x,t) &= \zeta \circ d_\Gamma c^{in}(x,t) + (1 - \zeta \circ d_\Gamma)\left(c_+^{out}\chi_+ + c_-^{out}\chi_-\right) \\ &= c_+^{out}\chi_+ + c_-^{out}\chi_- + \left(c^{in}(x,t) - c_+^{out}\chi_+ - c_-^{out}\chi_-\right)\zeta \circ d_\Gamma \end{aligned} \tag{4.25}$$

where $c_\pm^{out} = \pm 1$ and ζ is as in (1.20). Moreover, ρ is as in (4.2) and we define $c_{A,2}$, $c_{A,3}$ by

$$c_{A,j}(x,t) = \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \varepsilon^j c_j^{in}(x,t), \quad j = 2, 3 \tag{4.26}$$

with c_j^{in} as in (4.1).

Remark 4.6 We note that we have chosen $c_\pm^{out} = \pm 1$ as approximation of c_ε in $(\Omega \times [0, T_0]) \setminus \Gamma(\delta)$ (the region of the outer expansion). One can also derive this (formally) by expanding c_ε in this outer region in the form $\sum_{k=0}^2 \varepsilon^k c_k^\pm(x,t)$. Since the calculations are simple and standard, we omit them.

Lemma 4.7 *Assume that* (3.4) *holds true for some* $M > 0$ *and let* $k \in \mathbb{N}$. *Then there are* $C(M), C_k(M) > 0$, *independent of* $T_\varepsilon, \varepsilon$, *and* ε_0 *such that for all* $0 < \varepsilon \le \varepsilon_0$ *and* $\theta \in (0,1)$

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T_\varepsilon} \|c^{in}(t,\cdot) - c_+^{out}\chi_+ - c_-^{out}\chi_-\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta)\setminus\Gamma_t(\delta))} \le C(M)\varepsilon^{3N}, \tag{4.27}$$

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T_\varepsilon} \varepsilon^2 \|c_2^{in}(t)\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta)\setminus\Gamma_t(\delta))} + \max_{j=0,2}\sup_{0\le t\le T_\varepsilon} \varepsilon^j \|\nabla c_j^{in}(t)\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta)\setminus\Gamma_t(\delta))} \le C(M)\varepsilon^{3N}, \tag{4.28}$$

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T_\varepsilon} \varepsilon^3 \|c_3^{in}(t)\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta)\setminus\Gamma_t(\delta))} + \varepsilon^3 \|\nabla c_3^{in}\|_{L^2(0,T_\varepsilon;L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta)\setminus\Gamma_t(\delta))} \le C_k(M)\varepsilon^k. \tag{4.29}$$

Proof: First of all $h_{2,\varepsilon}$ is uniformly bounded since $X_{T_\varepsilon} \hookrightarrow L^\infty([0,T_\varepsilon]\times\mathbb{T}^1)$ with operator norm bounded independently of $T_\varepsilon \in (0, T_0]$. On the other hand, if $2\delta > |d_\Gamma(x,t)| > \delta$, then

$$|\rho| = \left|\frac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_1(s,t) - \varepsilon h_{2,\varepsilon}(s,t)\right| \ge \frac{\delta}{2\varepsilon} \tag{4.30}$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ if $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1]$ is chosen sufficently small. Moreover, we have, because of (1.19), (4.12), and (4.13), that

$$|\theta_0(\rho) - c_\pm^{out}| + |\theta_0'(\rho)| \le Ce^{-\alpha|\rho|} \qquad \text{if } \rho \gtrless 0, \tag{4.31a}$$

$$|\hat c_2(\rho,s,t)| + |\partial_\rho \hat c_2(\rho,s,t)| + |\partial_s \hat c_2(\rho,s,t)| \le Ce^{-\alpha|\rho|}, \tag{4.31b}$$

$$\varepsilon^\theta |\hat c_3(\rho,s,t)| \le C(M,\theta) \tag{4.31c}$$

for all $(\rho,s,t) \in \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T_0]$ and some $C, C(M,\theta), \alpha > 0$, where $\theta > 0$ is arbitrary.

For the following we denote $\Sigma_t = \Gamma_t(2\delta)\setminus\Gamma_t(\delta)$. Because of (4.30), (4.31a), and (4.31b), one easily obtains

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T_\varepsilon}\left[\|c_0^{in}(t) - c_+^{out}\chi_+ - c_-^{out}\chi_-\|_{L^2(\Sigma_t)} + \varepsilon^2\|c_2^{in}(t)\|_{L^2(\Sigma_t)}\right] \le Ce^{-\frac{\alpha\delta}{2\varepsilon}} \le C'\varepsilon^{3N},$$

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T_\varepsilon}\left[\|\nabla c_0^{in}(t)\|_{L^2(\Sigma_t)} + \varepsilon^2\|\nabla c_2^{in}(t)\|_{L^2(\Sigma_t)}\right] \le C\frac{e^{-\frac{\alpha\delta}{2\varepsilon}}}{\varepsilon} \le C'\varepsilon^{3N}$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0]$ and some $C, C', \alpha > 0$. This shows (4.27)-(4.28).

To prove the first inequality in (4.29), we employ (4.30) and a change of variable to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{0\le t\le T_\varepsilon} \varepsilon^3\|c_3^{in}\|_{L^2(\Sigma_t)} = \sup_{0\le t\le T_\varepsilon} \varepsilon^3\|\rho^{-k}\rho^k c_3^{in}\|_{L^2(\Sigma_t)} \\ \le& C\varepsilon^k\delta^{-k}\sup_{0\le t\le T_\varepsilon}\varepsilon^3\|\rho^k c_3^{in}\|_{L^2(\Sigma_t)} \le C_k\varepsilon^k\sup_{0\le t\le T_\varepsilon}\varepsilon^3\|\rho^k\hat c_3(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^1\times\mathbb{R})}. \end{aligned}$$

So the inequality follows by applying (4.13). The proof of the second inequality in (4.29) is done in the same way using additionally

$$\|\rho^k \partial_\rho \hat{c}_3\|_{L^4((0,T_\varepsilon)\times\mathbb{T}^1;L^2(\mathbb{R}))} \leq C \left(\sup_{t\in[0,T_\varepsilon],s\in\mathbb{T}^1} \|\partial_\rho \hat{c}_3(\cdot,s,t,)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\rho^{2k}\partial_\rho \hat{c}_3\|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{L^2((0,T_\varepsilon)\times\mathbb{T}^1\times\mathbb{R})}$$

to estimate the leading term related to $\partial_\rho \hat{c}_3 \nabla^\Gamma h_{2,\varepsilon}$. ∎

Lemma 4.8 *Let* (1.26) *hold true. Then there are some* $\varepsilon_1, T_1 > 0$ *independent of* $\varepsilon, T_\varepsilon, c_\varepsilon, c_A$ *such that*

$$\|c_\varepsilon(t) - c_{A,0}(t)\|_{L^4(0,T_\varepsilon;L^2(\Omega))} + \|\nabla(c_\varepsilon - c_{A,0})\|_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,T_\varepsilon)\setminus\Gamma(\delta)))} \leq \frac{3}{2} R\varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \text{(4.32a)}$$

$$\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}(c_\varepsilon - c_{A,0})\|_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,T_\varepsilon)\cap\Gamma(2\delta))} + \varepsilon\|\partial_{\mathbf{n}}(c_\varepsilon - c_{A,0})\|_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,T_\varepsilon)\cap\Gamma(2\delta))} \leq \frac{3}{2} R\varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{(4.32b)}$$

and (3.4) *holds true, where* $M = M(R)$ *is as in Lemma 4.2, provided* $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_1$ *and* $T_\varepsilon \leq T_1$.

Proof: Using the triangle inequality, the proof of (4.32) can be reduced to the corresponding estimate for $c_A - c_{A,0}$. For example, for the first estimate, since

$$\|c_\varepsilon(t) - c_{A,0}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|c_\varepsilon(t) - c_A(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|c_A(t) - c_{A,0}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

and because of the assumptions (1.26), we only need to estimate the last term suitably. We also know from (4.25) and (3.2) that

$$c_A - c_{A,0} = (c^{in}(x,t) - \theta_0(\rho))\zeta \circ d_\Gamma = (\varepsilon^2 c_2^{in}(x,t) + \varepsilon^3 c_3^{in}(x,t))\zeta \circ d_\Gamma.$$

Now let $M = M(R)$, ε_1, and T_1 be as in Lemma 4.2. Because of $h_{2,\varepsilon}|_{t=0} = 0$, there is some $T'_\varepsilon \in (0, T_\varepsilon]$ such that $h_{2,\varepsilon}$ satisfies (3.4) with T'_ε instead of T_ε. Hence we can apply Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.7 to conclude

$$\|c_A(t) - c_{A,0}(t)\|_{L^4(0,T'_\varepsilon;L^2(\Omega))} + \|\nabla(c_A - c_{A,0})\|_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,T'_\varepsilon)\setminus\Gamma(\delta)))} \leq C(R,\varepsilon,T'_\varepsilon)\varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}},$$

$$\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}(c_A - c_{A,0})\|_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,T'_\varepsilon)\cap\Gamma(2\delta))} + \varepsilon\|\partial_{\mathbf{n}}(c_A - c_{A,0})\|_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,T'_\varepsilon)\cap\Gamma(2\delta))} \leq C(R,\varepsilon,T'_\varepsilon)\varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $C(R,\varepsilon,T) \to_{(\varepsilon,T)\to 0} 0$. Choosing $\varepsilon_1, T_1 > 0$ possibly even smaller we can achieve that $C(R,\varepsilon,T) \leq \frac{R}{2}$ provided $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_1$, $T \leq T_1$. This shows (4.32) for some $T'_\varepsilon \in (0, T_\varepsilon]$ instead of T_ε. In order to show the estimate for T_ε, let

$$\tilde{T}_\varepsilon := \sup\{T'_\varepsilon \in (0, T_\varepsilon] : (4.32) \text{ holds true for } T'_\varepsilon \text{ instead of } T_\varepsilon\}.$$

The previous step implies $\tilde{T}_\varepsilon > 0$. Now assume that $\tilde{T}_\varepsilon < T_\varepsilon$. Then (4.32) holds true for $\tilde{T}_\varepsilon$ instead of T_ε. Hence there is some $T'_\varepsilon \in (\tilde{T}_\varepsilon, T_\varepsilon]$ such that (3.39) holds true with T'_ε instead of T_ε. Then Lemma 4.2 implies that $h_{2,\varepsilon}$ satisfies (3.4) with T'_ε instead of T_ε and the first part of the proof shows (4.32) for T'_ε instead of T_ε provided $T_\varepsilon \leq T_1$ and $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_1$. This is a contradiction to the definition of $\tilde{T}_\varepsilon$. Hence $\tilde{T}_\varepsilon = T_\varepsilon$ and (4.32) holds true provided $T_\varepsilon \leq T_1$ and $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_1$. ∎

Corollary 4.9 *Let* (1.26) *hold true for some* $T_\varepsilon \leq T_1$ *and* $\varepsilon_0 \leq \varepsilon_1$, *where* T_1, ε_1 *are as in Lemma 4.8. Then*

$$\left| \int_0^T \int_\Omega \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2 \cdot \nabla c^{in}(c_\varepsilon - c_A) \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t \right| \leq C(R,T,\varepsilon)\varepsilon^{2N+1}$$

for every $T \in (0, T_\varepsilon]$ *and* $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$, *where* $C(R,T,\varepsilon)$ *is independent of* T_ε *and* ε_0 *and* $C(R,T,\varepsilon) \to_{(T,\varepsilon)\to 0} 0$.

Proof: We shall denote $u = c_\varepsilon - c_A$ as before. We use

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2 \cdot \nabla c^{in} = \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2 \cdot \nabla(\theta_0 + \varepsilon^2 c_2^{in} + \varepsilon^3 c_3^{in}) \tag{4.33}$$

and estimate each term separately.

Step 1: We have

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2 \cdot \nabla c_0^{in} = \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2 \cdot \left(\mathbf{n} - \varepsilon \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} h_1(s,t) - \varepsilon^2 \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} h_{2,\varepsilon}(s,t)\right) \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon} \theta_0' \left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon(s,t)\right).$$

Moreover, we use that

$$h_{2,\varepsilon} \in X_{T_\varepsilon} \hookrightarrow BUC([0,T_\varepsilon]; H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^1)) \hookrightarrow BUC([0,T_\varepsilon]; W_s^1(\mathbb{T}^1)),$$

is bounded with respect to $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ for any $s \in (1,\infty)$. Proposition 3.6 and Hölder's inequality imply that

$$\left\| \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2 \cdot \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon} \theta_0' \left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon\right) (\mathbf{n} - \varepsilon \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} h_\varepsilon) \right\|_{L^r(0,T;L^q)} \leq \tfrac{C}{\varepsilon} \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2\|_{L^r(0,T;L^{\tilde{q}})} \leq C(R) \varepsilon^{\frac{4}{r}-1}, \tag{4.34}$$

where $1 < r < 2$, $1 < q < \tilde{q} < 2$, $1 < s < \infty$ and $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{s} + \frac{1}{\tilde{q}}$. In the following let $r', q' \in (1,\infty)$ be such that $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{r'} = \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{q'} = 1$. Moreover, the Gagliardo-Nirenberg interpolation inequality and (1.26) imply

$$\|u\|_{L^{r'}(0,T;L^{q'})} \leq C \|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}^{1-\frac{2}{r'}} \|u\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1)}^{\frac{2}{r'}} \leq C(R) \varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}-\frac{2}{r'}} = C(R) \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{2}{r}} \tag{4.35}$$

if we choose $q' \in (2,\infty)$ (and therefore $q \in (1,2)$) such that $\frac{1}{q'} = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \frac{2}{r'})$. Hence

$$\left| \int_0^T \int_\Omega \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2 \cdot \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon} \theta_0' \left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon(s,t)\right) (\mathbf{n} - \varepsilon \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} h_\varepsilon(s,t))\, u \,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t \right| \leq C(R) \varepsilon^{\frac{4}{r}-1+\frac{2}{r}+\frac{1}{2}} = C(R) \varepsilon^{\frac{6}{r}-\frac{1}{2}}$$

for all $T \in (0, T_\varepsilon]$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$. If we choose now $r \in (1, \frac{12}{11})$, we have $\frac{6}{r} - \frac{1}{2} > 5$ and therefore

$$\left| \int_0^T \int_\Omega \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2 \cdot \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon} \theta_0' \left(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon(s,t)\right) (\mathbf{n} - \varepsilon \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} h_\varepsilon(s,t))\, u \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t \right| \leq C(R,T,\varepsilon) \varepsilon^{2N+1},$$

where $C(R,T,\varepsilon) \to_{(T,\varepsilon)\to 0} 0$.

Step 2: Now we estimate $\varepsilon^2 \int_0^T \int_\Omega \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2 \cdot \nabla c_2^{in} u \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t$. Because of (4.12), we obtain in a similar way as for (4.34) that

$$\|\zeta \circ d_\Gamma \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2 \cdot \nabla c_2^{in}\|_{L^r(0,T;L^q)} = \left\| \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2 \cdot \left((\tfrac{\mathbf{n}}{\varepsilon} - \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} h_\varepsilon) \partial_\rho \hat{c}_2 + \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} \hat{c}_2 \right) \right\|_{L^r(0,T;L^q)} \leq C(R) \varepsilon^{\frac{4}{r}-1}.$$

This together with (4.35) implies

$$\left| \varepsilon^2 \int_0^T \int_\Omega \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2 \cdot \nabla c_2^{in} (c_\varepsilon - c_A) \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t \right| \leq C(R,T,\varepsilon) \varepsilon^{2N+1}.$$

Step 3: We treat

$$\varepsilon^3 \int_0^T \int_\Omega \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2 \cdot \nabla c_3^{in} (c_\varepsilon - c_A) \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t.$$

In view of (1.23) and (4.31), we know that $|c_\varepsilon - c_A|$ is uniformly bounded in (x,t) and ε. On the other hand, it follows from (4.13) and the Gagliardo-Nirenberg interpolation inequality used in (4.35) that

$$\|(\varepsilon^\theta \partial_\rho \hat{c}_3, \varepsilon \partial_s \hat{c}_3)\|_{L^4((0,T)\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1)} \leq \|(\varepsilon^{2\theta} \partial_\rho \hat{c}_3, \varepsilon \partial_s \hat{c}_3)\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1))}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(\partial_\rho \hat{c}_3, \varepsilon \partial_s \hat{c}_3)\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1))}^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

is bounded, where we choose $\theta = \frac{1}{8}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\nabla c_3^{in}\|_{L^4(0,T;L^3(\Gamma_t(2\delta)))} = \|(\tfrac{\mathbf{n}}{\varepsilon} - \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} h_\varepsilon) \partial_\rho \hat{c}_3 + \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} \hat{c}_3\|_{L^4(0,T;L^3(\Gamma_t(2\delta)))} \\
&\leq \varepsilon^{-1} \|\partial_\rho \hat{c}_3\|_{L^4(0,T;L^3(\Gamma_t(2\delta)))} + \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} h_\varepsilon \partial_\rho \hat{c}_3\|_{L^4(0,T;L^3(\Gamma_t(2\delta)))} + \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} \hat{c}_3\|_{L^4(0,T;L^3(\Gamma_t(2\delta)))} \\
&\leq C \varepsilon^{-1+\frac{1}{4}-\theta} \|(\varepsilon^\theta \partial_\rho \hat{c}_3, \varepsilon \partial_s \hat{c}_3)\|_{L^4((0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^1\times\mathbb{R})} \leq C(R) \varepsilon^{-1+\frac{1}{8}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (3.40c), $r = q = \frac{4}{3}$, leads to

$$\left|\varepsilon^3 \int_0^T \int_\Omega \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2 \cdot \nabla c_3^{in}(c_\varepsilon - c_A) \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t\right| \leq C(R)\varepsilon^{6-1+\frac{1}{8}} \leq C(R,T,\varepsilon)\varepsilon^{2N+1}$$

with $C(R,T,\varepsilon) \to_{(T,\varepsilon)\to 0} 0$. ∎

Proof of Theorem 1.3: Again we denote $u = c_\varepsilon - c_A$. We first note that, since (1.26) is assumed, it follows from Lemma 4.8 that both (3.4) and (4.32) and thus (3.39) are valid if $\varepsilon \leq \min\{\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1\}$ and $T_\varepsilon \leq \min\{T_0, T_1\}$. So the assumptions for applying Proposition 3.6 and Theorem 4.5 are fulfilled. These together with (4.10) imply the estimate of $\mathbf{w}_1$

$$\|\mathbf{w}_1\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))} \leq \varepsilon^{-2}\left(C(R)\varepsilon^N + C(M)(T^{\frac{1}{4}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}})\varepsilon^N\right) = C(R) + C(M)(T^{\frac{1}{4}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}) \quad (4.36)$$

for all $T \in (0, T_\varepsilon]$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \min\{\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1\}]$. To proceed, we shall calculate

$$\partial_t c_A + (\mathbf{v}_A + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{w}_2) \cdot \nabla c_A + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma \cdot \nabla c_{A,0} - \Delta c_A + \frac{f'(c_A)}{\varepsilon^2}.$$

Using (4.25) and Lemma 4.7, we have the following asymptotics in $L^2(0, T_\varepsilon; L^2(\Omega))$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta c_A &= \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \Delta c^{in} + 2\nabla(\zeta \circ d_\Gamma) \cdot \nabla c^{in} + \Delta(\zeta \circ d_\Gamma)(c^{in} - c_+^{out}\chi_+ - c_-^{out}\chi_-) \\
&= \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \Delta c^{in} + O(\varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}}), \\
\partial_t c_A &= \partial_t(\zeta \circ d_\Gamma)(c^{in} - c_+^{out}\chi_+ - c_-^{out}\chi_-) + \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \partial_t c^{in} = O(\varepsilon^{N+\frac{3}{2}}) + \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \partial_t c^{in}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (4.31a), (4.31b), and (4.31c) that

$$|c^{in} - c_+^{out}\chi_+ - c_-^{out}\chi_-| \leq C(M)\varepsilon^{N+\frac{3}{4}} \quad \text{in } (\Gamma(3\delta) \setminus \Gamma(\delta)) \cap (\Omega \times (0, T_\varepsilon)). \quad (4.37)$$

This together with (1.10) and (4.36) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{v}_A + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{w}_2) \cdot \nabla c_A &= \zeta \circ d_\Gamma (\mathbf{v}_A + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{w}_2) \cdot \nabla c^{in} + (\mathbf{v}_A + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{w}_2) \cdot \nabla(\zeta \circ d_\Gamma)(c^{in} - c_+^{out}\chi_+ - c_-^{out}\chi_-) \\
&= \zeta \circ d_\Gamma (\mathbf{v}_A + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{w}_2) \cdot \nabla c^{in} + \underbrace{(\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{w}_1) \cdot \nabla(\zeta \circ d_\Gamma)(c^{in} - c_+^{out}\chi_+ - c_-^{out}\chi_-)}_{= O(\varepsilon^{N+\frac{3}{4}}) \text{ in } L^2(0,T_\varepsilon;L^2(\Omega))}.
\end{aligned}$$

The trace estimate, (4.31a), and (3.40a) imply

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon^2 \mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma \cdot \nabla c_{A,0} &= \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma \cdot \nabla c_0^{in} + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma \cdot \nabla(\zeta \circ d_\Gamma)(c_0^{in} - c_+^{out}\chi_+ - c_-^{out}\chi_-) \\
&= \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma \cdot \nabla c_0^{in} + O(\varepsilon^{N+\frac{3}{4}+N}) \qquad \text{in } L^2(0, T_\varepsilon; L^2(\Omega)).
\end{aligned}$$

To treat the bulk term we use (4.25) and (4.37) and obtain

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} f'(c_A) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} f'(c^{in}) & \text{in } \Gamma(\delta), \\ O(\varepsilon^{N+1}) & \text{in } \Gamma(2\delta) \setminus \Gamma(\delta), \\ 0 & \text{in } \Omega \times [0, T_\varepsilon] \setminus \Gamma(2\delta), \end{cases}$$

with respect to the $L^\infty(0, T_\varepsilon; L^2)$-norm. Actually, we only need to verify the case when $\delta < |d_\Gamma| < 2\delta$. With a Taylor expansion, (4.27), and (4.29) we obtain

$$f'(c_A) = f'(c_+^{out}\chi_+ + c_-^{out}\chi_-) + f''(\xi_\varepsilon(x,t))\left[(c^{in} - c_+^{out}\chi_+ - c_-^{out}\chi_-)\zeta \circ d_\Gamma\right] = 0 + O(\varepsilon^{N+3})$$

in $L^\infty(0, T_\varepsilon; L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta) \setminus \Gamma_t(\delta))$, where $\xi_\varepsilon(x,t)$ is uniformly bounded. In particular, we obtain

$$\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon^2} f'(c_A) = \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon^2} f'(c^{in}) + O(\varepsilon^{N+1}) \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, T_\varepsilon; L^2(\Omega)).$$

By collecting the above asymptotics, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t c_A + (\mathbf{v}_A + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{w}_2) \cdot \nabla c_A + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma \cdot \nabla c_{A,0} - \Delta c_A + \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon^2} f'(c_A) \\
&= \zeta \circ d_\Gamma \left(\partial_t c^{in} + \mathbf{v}_A^{in} \cdot \nabla c^{in} + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma \cdot \nabla c_0^{in} - \Delta c^{in} + \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon^2} f'(c^{in})\right) \\
&+ \zeta \circ d_\Gamma (\varepsilon^2 \mathbf{w}_2 + \mathbf{v}_A - \mathbf{v}_A^{in}) \cdot \nabla c^{in} + s_A, \qquad (4.38)
\end{aligned}$$

where $s_A = O(\varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}})$ in $L^2(0,T_\varepsilon;L^2(\Omega))$. This together with Theorem 4.5 leads to

$$\begin{aligned}&\partial_t c_A + (\mathbf{v}_A + \varepsilon^2\mathbf{w}_2)\cdot\nabla c_A + \varepsilon^2\mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma\cdot\nabla c_A - \Delta c_A + \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon^2}f'(c_A)\\ &\quad= \zeta\circ d_\Gamma\mathfrak{C} + \zeta\circ d_\Gamma(\varepsilon^2\mathbf{w}_2 + \mathbf{v}_A - \mathbf{v}_A^{in})\cdot\nabla c^{in} + \varepsilon^2\mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma\cdot\nabla(c_A - c_{A,0}) + s_A.\end{aligned}$$

Due to (3.5), we have

$$\mathbf{v}_A - \mathbf{v}_A^{in} = (\zeta\circ d_\Gamma - 1)(\mathbf{v}_A^{in} - \mathbf{v}_A^+\chi_+ - \mathbf{v}_A^-\chi_-) = \sum_{i=0}^{2}(\zeta\circ d_\Gamma - 1)\varepsilon^i(\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{v}_i^+\chi_+ - \mathbf{v}_i^-\chi_-).$$

This together with (4.30) and Lemma 3.3 implies that, the term $\zeta\circ d_\Gamma(\mathbf{v}_A - \mathbf{v}_A^{in})\cdot\nabla c^{in}$ in (4.38) can be absorbed into s_A. Moreover, because of (1.26), Theorem 4.5 and Corollary 4.9, we obtain

$$\int_0^T\left|\int_\Omega \zeta\circ d_\Gamma\left(\mathfrak{C} + \varepsilon^2\mathbf{w}_2\cdot\nabla c^{in}\right)(c_\varepsilon - c_A)(x,t)\mathrm{d}x\right|\mathrm{d}t \le C(R,T,\varepsilon)\varepsilon^{2N+1}$$

for all $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0]$ and $T\in(0,\min(T_\varepsilon,T_1)]$, where $C(R,T,\varepsilon)\to_{(T,\varepsilon)\to 0}0$.

To show (1.27) it remains to estimate $\varepsilon^2\mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma\cdot\nabla(c_A - c_{A,0})$ since

$$\int_0^T |s_A(x,t)u(x,t)\mathrm{d}x|\,\mathrm{d}t \le C\varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}}\|u\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2)} \le C(R)T^{\frac{1}{2}}\varepsilon^{2N+1}.$$

With the aid of Sobolev embeddings we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^T\int_\Omega |u\varepsilon^2\mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma\cdot\nabla(c_A - c_{A,0})|\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t\\ &\le CT^{\frac{1}{4}}\|\varepsilon^2\mathbf{w}_1\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1)}\|\nabla(c_A - c_{A,0})\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}\|u\|_{L^4(0,T;L^4)}\\ &\le C_pT^{\frac{1}{4}}\|\varepsilon^2\mathbf{w}_1\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1)}\|\nabla(c_A - c_{A,0})\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}\|u\|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}\|u\|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{L^2(0,T;H^1)}\end{aligned}$$

due to $\|u\|_{L^4(\Omega)}\le C\|u\|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{L^2(\Omega)}\|u\|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{H^1(\Omega)}$. Because of (4.1) and (4.25), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla(c_A - c_{A,0}) &= \nabla(\zeta\circ d_\Gamma)(c^{in} - c_0^{in}) + \zeta\circ d_\Gamma\nabla(c^{in} - c_0^{in})\\ &= \nabla(\zeta\circ d_\Gamma)(\varepsilon^2c_2^{in} + \varepsilon^3c_3^{in}) + \zeta\circ d_\Gamma\nabla(\varepsilon^2c_2^{in} + \varepsilon^3c_3^{in}).\end{aligned}$$

Hence Lemma 4.3 yields

$$\|\nabla(c_A - c_{A,0})\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} \le C(R)\varepsilon^{N-\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{4.39}$$

This together with (1.26) and (4.36) implies

$$\int_0^T\int_\Omega |u\,\varepsilon^2\mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma\cdot\nabla(c_A - c_{A,0})|\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t \le C(R)\varepsilon^{3N-1/2} = C(R)\varepsilon^{2N+3/2}.$$

Therefore the proof of Theorem 1.3 is finished. ∎

5 Estimates of Approximate and Exact Solutions

5.1 Estimates of the Error in the Velocity and the Remainder in the Linearization of f'

We first recall that $c_{A,0}$ is defined in (3.2), $u_1 = c_\varepsilon - c_{A,0}$ and $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_A + \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1 + \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_A$ is the solution of (3.1) and $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2$ are as in Section 3.2, i.e., solve (3.31)-(3.35). Moreover, we define

$$\mathbf{w}_1 := \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_A - \mathbf{v}_A + \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1}{\varepsilon^2} \quad\text{and}\quad \mathbf{w}_2 = \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2}{\varepsilon^2}.$$

Then $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{v}_A + \varepsilon^2(\mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbf{w}_2)$. We note that, under the assumption (1.26), it follows from Lemma 4.8 that both (3.4) and (4.32) and thus (3.39) are valid if $\varepsilon \le \min\{\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1\}$ and $T_\varepsilon \le \min\{T_0, T_1\}$. So the assumptions for applying Proposition 3.6 and Theorem 4.5 are fulfilled and we have the following estimate on $\mathbf{w}_1$:

$$\|\mathbf{w}_1\|_{L^2(0,T,H^1(\Omega))} \le C(R), \quad \|\mathbf{w}_1\|_{L^2(0,T,L^2(\Omega))} \le C(R)\left(T^{\frac{1}{4}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \tag{5.1}$$

for all $T \in (0, \min(T_1, T_\varepsilon)]$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \min(\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1)]$ provided (1.26) holds true.

Lemma 5.1 *Let ε_1, T_1 be as in Lemma 4.8. Then there is some $C(R)$ such that under the assumptions* (1.26) *we have for all $T \in (0, \min(T_1, T_\varepsilon)]$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \min(\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1)]$*

$$\varepsilon^2 \int_0^T \left| \int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \left(\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{w}_{1,\mathbf{n}} - \mathbf{w}_{1,\mathbf{n}}|_\Gamma)\right) \theta_0'(\rho)(c_\varepsilon - c_A)\mathrm{d}x \right| \mathrm{d}t \le C(R)\left(T^{\frac{1}{8}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}\right)\varepsilon^{2N+1},$$

$$\varepsilon^2 \int_0^T \left| \int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \theta_0'(\rho)(\mathbf{w}_{1,\boldsymbol{\tau}} - \mathbf{w}_{1,\boldsymbol{\tau}}|_\Gamma) \cdot \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} h_\varepsilon(S(x,t),t)(c_\varepsilon - c_A)\mathrm{d}x \right| \mathrm{d}t \le C(R)\varepsilon^{2N+\frac{3}{2}}.$$

Proof: For the sake of simplifying the presentation, let us denote $u = c_\varepsilon - c_A$ and $\mathbf{w} = \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{w}_1$. *Proof of the first inequality:* It follows from (2.13) and $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{w} = -\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_A$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{w}_\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{w}_\mathbf{n}|_\Gamma)\theta_0'(\rho)u(x,t)\mathrm{d}x \\
&= \int_{-2\delta}^{2\delta} \int_{\Gamma_t} \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{w}_\mathbf{n}(r,p,t) - \mathbf{w}_\mathbf{n}(0,p,t))\theta_0'(\tfrac{r}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon)u(r,p,t)J(r,p,t)\mathrm{d}\sigma(p)\mathrm{d}r \\
&= \int_{-2\delta}^{2\delta} \int_{\Gamma_t} \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^r \partial_\mathbf{n}\mathbf{w}_\mathbf{n}(r',p,t)\mathrm{d}r'\, \theta_0'(\tfrac{r}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon)u(r,p,t)J(r,p,t)\mathrm{d}\sigma(p)\mathrm{d}r \\
&= -\int_{-2\delta}^{2\delta} \int_{\Gamma_t} \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^r \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_A(r',p,t)\mathrm{d}r'\, \theta_0'(\tfrac{r}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon)u(r,p,t)J(r,p,t)\mathrm{d}\sigma(p)\mathrm{d}r \\
&\quad - \int_{-2\delta}^{2\delta} \int_{\Gamma_t} \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^r \operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} \mathbf{w}(r',p,t)\mathrm{d}r'\, \theta_0'(\tfrac{r}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon)u(r,p,t)J(r,p,t)\mathrm{d}\sigma(p)\mathrm{d}r \\
&= -\int_{-2\delta}^{2\delta} \int_{\Gamma_t} \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^r \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_A(r',p,t)\mathrm{d}r'\, \theta_0'(\tfrac{r}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon)u(r,p,t)J(r,p,t)\mathrm{d}\sigma(p)\mathrm{d}r \\
&\quad + \int_{-2\delta}^{2\delta} \int_{\Gamma_t} \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^r \mathbf{w}(r',p,t)\mathrm{d}r'\, \theta_0'(\tfrac{r}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon) \cdot \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}(u(r,p,t)J(r,p,t))\mathrm{d}\sigma(p)\mathrm{d}r \\
&\quad + \int_{-2\delta}^{2\delta} \int_{\Gamma_t} \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^r \mathbf{w}(r',p,t)\mathrm{d}r' \cdot \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} h_\varepsilon(X_0^{-1}(p,t),t)\theta_0''(\tfrac{r}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon)u(r,p,t)J(r,p,t)\mathrm{d}\sigma(p)\mathrm{d}r \\
&\quad + \int_{-2\delta}^{2\delta} \int_{\Gamma_t} \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^r \mathbf{w}_\mathbf{n}(r',p,t)\mathrm{d}r'\, \theta_0'(\tfrac{r}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon)u(r,p,t)\kappa(r,p,t)J(r,p,t)\mathrm{d}\sigma(p)\mathrm{d}r \\
&\quad + O(e^{-\frac{\alpha\delta}{2\varepsilon}}) \text{ in } L^2(0,T).
\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 3.4 one can show in a straight forward manner that

$$|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_A(r',p,t)| \le C(M)(\varepsilon|r'| + \varepsilon^2)\left(\|h_{2,\varepsilon}(t)\|_{C^1(\mathbb{T}^1)} + 1\right) \quad \text{for all } r' \in (-2\delta, \delta), p \in \Gamma(t)$$

and $t \in [0, \min(T_\varepsilon, T_1)], \varepsilon \in (0, \min(\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1))$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \int_{-2\delta}^{2\delta} \int_{\Gamma_t} \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^r \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_A(r',p,t)\mathrm{d}r'\, \theta_0'(\tfrac{r}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon)u(r,p,t)J(r,p,t)\mathrm{d}\sigma(p)\mathrm{d}r \right| \\
&\le C(M) \int_{-2\delta}^{2\delta} \int_{\Gamma_t} (\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon|r|)|\theta_0'(\tfrac{r}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon)||u(r,p,t)|J(r,p,t)\mathrm{d}\sigma(p)\mathrm{d}r\left(\|h_{2,\varepsilon}(t)\|_{C^1(\mathbb{T}^1)} + 1\right) \\
&\le C(M)\varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}}\|u(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\left(\|h_{2,\varepsilon}(t)\|_{C^1(\mathbb{T}^1)} + 1\right)
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we note that

$$\left|\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_0^r \mathbf{w}(r',p,t)\mathrm{d}r'\right| \le C\|\mathbf{w}(\cdot,p,t)\|_{L^\infty(-2\delta,2\delta)}\tfrac{|r|}{\varepsilon}. \tag{5.2}$$

Hence we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)} \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{w_n}-\mathbf{w_n}|_\Gamma)\theta_0'(\rho)u(x,t)\mathrm{d}x\right|\\
&\le C(M)\varepsilon^{N+\frac12}\|u(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\left(\|h_{2,\varepsilon}(t)\|_{C^1(\mathbb{T}^1)}+1\right)\\
&\quad + C\int_{-2\delta}^{2\delta}\int_{\Gamma_t}\|\mathbf{w}(\cdot,p,t)\|_{L^\infty(-2\delta,2\delta)}\left(1+|(\partial_s h_\varepsilon)(X_0^{-1}(p,t),t)|\right)\\
&\qquad\qquad \tfrac{|r|}{\varepsilon}\left(|\theta_0''(\tfrac{r}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon)|+|\theta_0'(\tfrac{r}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon)|\right)|(u,\nabla_{\boldsymbol\tau}u)(r,p,t)|\mathrm{d}\sigma(p)\mathrm{d}r + O(e^{-\frac{\alpha\delta}{2\varepsilon}})\\
&\le C(M)\varepsilon^{N+\frac12}\|u(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\left(\|h_{2,\varepsilon}(t)\|_{C^1(\mathbb{T}^1)}+1\right)\\
&\quad + C\left\|\|\mathbf{w}(\cdot,P_{\Gamma_t}(\cdot),t)\|_{L^\infty(-2\delta,2\delta)}\left(1+|(\partial_s h_\varepsilon)(S(\cdot,t),t)|\right)|\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}|(|\theta_0'(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon)|+|\theta_0''(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon)|)\right\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\\
&\quad\cdot\left(\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol\tau}u\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}+\|u\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\right)+O(e^{-\frac{\alpha\delta}{2\varepsilon}}) \qquad \text{in } L^2(0,T).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $h_\varepsilon = h_1+\varepsilon h_{2,\varepsilon}$ is uniformly bounded and

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty(-2\delta,2\delta)} \le C\|f\|^{\frac12}_{L^2(-2\delta,2\delta)}\|f\|^{\frac12}_{H^1(-2\delta,2\delta)},$$

applying the second inequality of Corollary 2.7 yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\|\mathbf{w}(\cdot,P_{\Gamma_t}(\cdot),t)\|_{L^\infty(-2\delta,2\delta)}\left(1+|(\partial_s h_\varepsilon)(S(\cdot,t),t)|\right)|\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}|(|\theta_0''(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon)|+|\theta_0'(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon)|)\right\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\\
&\le C\varepsilon^{\frac12}\left\|\|\mathbf{w}(\cdot,P_{\Gamma_t}(\cdot),t)\|_{L^\infty(-2\delta,2\delta)}\left(1+|(\partial_s h_\varepsilon)(S(\cdot,t),t)|\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t)}\\
&\le C\varepsilon^{\frac12}\left(\|\mathbf{w}\|^{\frac12}_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\mathbf{w}\|^{\frac12}_{H^1(\Omega)}+\varepsilon\|\mathbf{w}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\|h_{2,\varepsilon}\|_{W^1_4(\mathbb{T}^1)}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above estimates with (1.26), (3.4), and (5.1), we conclude

$$\int_0^T\left|\int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)}\left(\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{w_n}-\mathbf{w_n}|_\Gamma)\right)\theta_0'(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon)u(x,t)\mathrm{d}x\right|\mathrm{d}t \le C(M,R)\left(T^{\frac18}+\varepsilon^{\frac14}\right)\varepsilon^{2N+1}. \tag{5.3}$$

Proof of the second inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)}\theta_0'(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon)(\mathbf{w_\tau}-\mathbf{w_\tau}|_\Gamma)\cdot\nabla_{\boldsymbol\tau}h_\varepsilon(S(x,t),t)u(x,t)\mathrm{d}x\\
&=\int_{-2\delta}^{2\delta}\int_{\Gamma_t}\theta_0'(\tfrac{r}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon)(\mathbf{w_\tau}(r,p,t)-\mathbf{w_\tau}(0,p,t))\cdot\nabla_{\boldsymbol\tau}h_\varepsilon(X_0^{-1}(p,t),t)u(r,p,t)J(r,p,t)\mathrm{d}\sigma(p)\mathrm{d}r\\
&=\int_{-2\delta}^{2\delta}\int_{\Gamma_t}\theta_0'(\tfrac{r}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon)\underbrace{\int_0^r\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{w_\tau}(r',p,t)\mathrm{d}r'}_{|\cdot|\le\sqrt{r}\|\mathbf{w}(\cdot,p,t)\|_{H^1(-2\delta,2\delta)}}\cdot\nabla_{\boldsymbol\tau}h_\varepsilon(X_0^{-1}(p,t),t)u(r,p,t)J(r,p,t)\mathrm{d}\sigma(p)\mathrm{d}r.
\end{aligned}$$

This along with $h_\varepsilon\in X_{T_\varepsilon}\hookrightarrow L^2(0,T_\varepsilon;C^1(\mathbb{T}^1))$ leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)}(\mathbf{w_\tau}-\mathbf{w_\tau}|_\Gamma)\cdot\nabla_{\boldsymbol\tau}h_\varepsilon(S(x,t),t)u(x,t)\mathrm{d}x\right|\\
&\le C\int_{-2\delta}^{2\delta}\int_{\Gamma_t}\sqrt{|r|}\left|\theta_0'(\tfrac{r}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon)\right|\|\mathbf{w}(\cdot,p,t)\|_{H^1(-2\delta,2\delta)}|u(r,p,t)||\partial_s h_\varepsilon(X_0^{-1}(p,t),t)|\mathrm{d}\sigma(p)\mathrm{d}r\\
&= C\int_{-2\delta}^{2\delta}\int_{\Gamma_t}\varepsilon^{\frac12}\sqrt{|\tfrac{r}{\varepsilon}|}|\theta_0'(\tfrac{r}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon)|\|\mathbf{w}(\cdot,p,t)\|_{H^1(-2\delta,2\delta)}|u(r,p,t)|\mathrm{d}\sigma(p)\mathrm{d}r\|h_\varepsilon(\cdot,t)\|_{C^1(\mathbb{T}^1)}\\
&\le C\varepsilon^{\frac12}\left\|\sqrt{|\tfrac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}|}\theta_0'(\tfrac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon)\|\mathbf{w}(\cdot,P_{\Gamma_t}(\cdot),t)\|_{H^1(-2\delta,2\delta)}\right\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\|u(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\|h_\varepsilon(\cdot,t)\|_{C^1(\mathbb{T}^1)}\\
&\le C\varepsilon\|\mathbf{w}\|_{H^1(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\|u\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}(1+\varepsilon\|h_{2,\varepsilon}\|_{C^1(\mathbb{T}^1)})
\end{aligned}$$

In this last step, we employed Corollary 2.7 to gain the factor $\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then the second inequality follows by integrating the above estimate, (5.1), and (1.26). ∎

Using the above lemma, we can prove the following important estimate:

Lemma 5.2 *Let ε_1, T_1 be as in Lemma 4.8. Then there is some $C(R)$ such that under the assumptions* (1.26)*, we have*

$$\varepsilon^2 \int_0^T \left| \int_\Omega (\mathbf{w}_1 - \mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma) \cdot \nabla c_A \ (c_\varepsilon - c_A) \mathrm{d}x \right| \mathrm{d}t \leq C(R)(T^{1/8} + \varepsilon^{1/4}) \varepsilon^{2N+1}$$

provided $0 < \varepsilon \leq \min(\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1)$ and $0 < T \leq \min(T_\varepsilon, T_1)$.

Proof: We shall denote $\mathcal{R} := \varepsilon^2(\mathbf{w}_1 - \mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma) \cdot \nabla c_A$. As before, it follows from Proposition 3.6 and Lemma 4.8 that, under the assumption (1.26) the estimate (3.40a) holds true. We shall prove the statement by distinguishing the cases $|d| \leq \delta$, $\delta < |d| < 2\delta$ and $|d| \geq 2\delta$. According to the definition of c_A in (4.25)

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Omega \setminus \Gamma_t(2\delta)} |\mathcal{R} \ u| \, \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t = 0,$$

where $u = c_\varepsilon - c_A$. For the integral over the domain $\Gamma_t(2\delta) \setminus \Gamma_t(\delta)$, we first note that $\|\mathbf{w}_1\|_{L^2(0,T_\varepsilon;H^1)}$ is uniformly bounded due to (5.1). Hence $\|\mathbf{w}_1 - \mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma\|_{L^2(0,T_\varepsilon;L^4)}$ is uniformly bounded because of $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_t) \hookrightarrow L^4(\Gamma_t)$ and $H^1(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^4(\Omega)$. Hence (1.26), (4.39) and Lemma 4.7 imply

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_t(2\delta)\setminus\Gamma_t(\delta)} |\mathcal{R} \ u| \, \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t \leq C\varepsilon^2 \|\nabla c_A\|_{L^\infty(0,T_\varepsilon;L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta)\setminus\Gamma_t(\delta)))} \|u\|_{L^2(0,T_\varepsilon;H^1(\Omega\setminus\Gamma_t(\delta)))} \leq C\varepsilon^{2N+2}$$

for any $T \in (0, T_\varepsilon]$. So it remains to estimate the integral in $\Gamma_t(\delta)$. For any $x \in \Gamma_t(\delta)$, it follows from (3.2) that $c_{A,0} = c_0^{in}$ and thus we can decompose $\mathcal{R}$ into

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R} =& -\varepsilon^2(\mathbf{w}_1 - \mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma) \cdot \nabla(c_A - c_{A,0}) - \varepsilon^2(\mathbf{w}_1 - \mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma) \cdot \nabla c_{A,0} \\
=& - \underbrace{\varepsilon^2(\mathbf{w}_1 - \mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma) \cdot \nabla(c_A - c_{A,0})}_{=:\mathcal{R}_1} - \underbrace{\tfrac{\theta_0'(\rho)}{\varepsilon}\varepsilon^2(\mathbf{w}_{1,\mathbf{n}} - \mathbf{w}_{1,\mathbf{n}}|_\Gamma)}_{=:\mathcal{R}_2} + \underbrace{\theta_0'(\rho)\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} h_\varepsilon \varepsilon^2 \cdot (\mathbf{w}_{1,\boldsymbol{\tau}} - \mathbf{w}_{1,\boldsymbol{\tau}}|_\Gamma)}_{=:\mathcal{R}_3}.
\end{aligned}$$

The terms $\mathcal{R}_2$ and $\mathcal{R}_3$ are treated in Lemma 5.1. For $\mathcal{R}_1$, we proceed in a similar way as in the proof of Theorem 1.3 using Sobolev embeddings,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_t(\delta)} |\mathcal{R}_1 u| \, \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t \leq C\|\varepsilon^2 \mathbf{w}_1\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1)} \|\nabla(c_A - c_{A,0})\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} \|u\|_{L^2(0,T;L^4)} \\
&\leq C\|\varepsilon^2 \mathbf{w}_1\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1)} \|\nabla(c_A - c_{A,0})\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} \|u\|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} \|u\|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{L^2(0,T;H^1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

In view of (1.26), (5.1), and (4.39)

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Gamma_t(\delta)} |\mathcal{R}_1 u| \, \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t \leq C\varepsilon^{3N-1/2} = C\varepsilon^{2N+3/2}.$$

∎

Lemma 5.3 *Under the assumptions* (1.26)*, for every $0 \leq T \leq T_\varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ we have*

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \left| \int_0^T \int_\Omega \left[f'(c_\varepsilon) - f'(c_A) - f''(c_A)(c_\varepsilon - c_A) \right] (c_\varepsilon - c_A) \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t \right| \leq C(R)(T^{\frac{1}{4}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}) \varepsilon^{2N+1}$$

provided $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1)$ is sufficiently small.

The proof is based on:

Lemma 5.4 *There is some $C>0$ such that for every $u\in H^1(\Omega)$ and $t\in[0,T_0],\delta'\in(0,2\delta]$:*

$$\|u\|^3_{L^3(\Gamma_t(\delta'))}\le C\left(\|u\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(\delta'))}+\|\partial_{\mathbf{n}}u\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(\delta'))}\right)^{\frac12}\left(\|u\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(\delta'))}+\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol\tau}u\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(\delta'))}\right)\|u\|^{\frac32}_{L^2(\Gamma_t(\delta'))}.$$

Proof: We use that

$$\|u\|^3_{L^3(\Gamma_t(\delta'))}\le C\int_{-\delta'}^{\delta'}\int_{\Gamma_t}|u(p,r,t)|^3\mathrm{d}\sigma(p)\mathrm{d}r=C\left\|\|u(\cdot,r,t)\|_{L^3(\Gamma_t)}\right\|^3_{L^3(-\delta',\delta')},$$

where $\|u\|_{L^3(\Gamma_t)}\le C\|u\|^{\frac13}_{H^1(\Gamma_t)}\|u\|^{\frac23}_{L^2(\Gamma_t)}$ since Γ_t is one-dimensional. Hence Hölder's inequality together with Minkowski inequality imply

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|u\|^3_{L^3(\Gamma_t(\delta'))}\\
&\le C\left\|\|u(r,\cdot,t)\|_{H^1(\Gamma_t)}\right\|_{L^2(-\delta',\delta')}\left\|\|u(r,\cdot,t)\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t)}\right\|^2_{L^4(-\delta',\delta')}\\
&\le C\left\|\|u(r,\cdot,t)\|_{H^1(\Gamma_t)}\right\|_{L^2(-\delta',\delta')}\left\|\|u(\cdot,p,t)\|_{L^4(-\delta',\delta')}\right\|^2_{L^2(\Gamma_t)}\\
&\le C\left\|\|u(r,\cdot,t)\|_{H^1(\Gamma_t)}\right\|_{L^2(-\delta',\delta')}\left\|\|u(\cdot,p,t)\|_{L^2(-\delta',\delta')}\right\|^{\frac32}_{L^2(\Gamma_t)}\left\|\|u(\cdot,p,t)\|_{H^1(-\delta',\delta')}\right\|^{\frac12}_{L^2(\Gamma_t)}
\end{aligned}$$

since $\|f\|_{L^4(-\delta',\delta')}\le C\|f\|^{\frac34}_{L^2(-\delta',\delta')}\|f\|^{\frac14}_{H^1(-\delta',\delta')}$ for all $f\in H^1(-\delta',\delta')$. ∎

Proof of Lemma 5.3: As before, we shall denote $u=c_\varepsilon-c_A$ for simplicity. The estimate in $\Gamma(2\delta)$ follows from Lemma 5.4 and (1.26)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T\|u\|^3_{L^3(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\mathrm{d}t\\
&\le C\|(u,\partial_{\mathbf{n}}u)\|^{\frac12}_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,T)\cap\Gamma(2\delta))}\|(u,\nabla_{\boldsymbol\tau}u)\|_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,T)\cap\Gamma(2\delta))}\left(\int_0^T\|u(t)\|^6_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\right)^{\frac14}\\
&\le C\|(u,\partial_{\mathbf{n}}u)\|^{\frac12}_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,T)\cap\Gamma(2\delta))}\|(u,\nabla_{\boldsymbol\tau}u)\|_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,T)\cap\Gamma(2\delta))}T^{\frac14}\sup_{0\le t\le T}\|u(t)\|^{\frac32}_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))}\\
&\le CR^3T^{\frac14}\varepsilon^{3N+1}
\end{aligned}$$

and in $\Omega\setminus\Gamma_t(\delta)$ we can use the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality in two dimensions and (1.26):

$$\int_0^T\|u\|^3_{L^3(\Omega\setminus\Gamma_t(\delta))}\mathrm{d}t\le C\int_0^T\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega\setminus\Gamma_t(\delta))}\|u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\setminus\Gamma_t(\delta))}\mathrm{d}t\le C(R\varepsilon^{N+\frac12})^3.$$

The above two estimates together with the following formula imply the desired result:

$$|[f'(a)-f'(b)-f''(a)(a-b)](a-b)|=\frac12|f'''((1-\theta)b+\theta a)(a-b)^3|\le C|a-b|^3$$

for all $a,b\in[-L,L]$, where $\theta=\theta(a,b)\in[0,1]$. Here we used that

$$\sup_{x\in\Omega,t\in[0,T_0],\varepsilon\in(0,1]}|c_\varepsilon(x,t)|\le L:=\max(2,\sup_{\varepsilon\in(0,1]}\|c_{\varepsilon,0}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)})$$

cf. Remarks 1.2 and

$$\sup_{x\in\Omega,t\in[0,T_0]}|c_A(x,t)|\le 2$$

for all $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0]$ if ε_0 is sufficiently small. The later assertion follows from

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to0}\sup_{x\in\Omega,t\in[0,T]}|c_A(x,t)|=1,$$

due to the construction of c_A. ∎

5.2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

We first note that h_1, h_2, and $\hat{c}_3$ are determined by (4.3), (4.9), and (4.11), resp., with initial data $(h_1, h_2, \hat{c}_3)\,|_{t=0} \equiv 0$. This together with the construction of c_A, more precisely (4.1) and (4.25) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} c_A(x,0) = \zeta(d_{\Gamma_0}(x)) \left(\theta_0(\tfrac{d_{\Gamma_0}(x)}{\varepsilon}) + \varepsilon^2 \hat{c}_2(\tfrac{d_{\Gamma_0}(x)}{\varepsilon}, S(x,0), 0)\right) \\ + (1 - \zeta(d_{\Gamma_0}(x))) \left(\chi_{\Omega^+(0)}(x) - \chi_{\Omega^-(0)}(x)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since the equation (4.4) that determines $\hat{c}_2$ has a smooth solution, we have

$$c_A(x,0) = c^0_{A,0}(x) + O(\varepsilon^{2+\frac{1}{2}}) \qquad \text{in } L^2(\Omega),$$

where we gained a factor $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ through the same change of variable as before. This together with the assumption that $\|c_{\varepsilon,0} - c^0_{A,0}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le C\varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}}$ implies the existence of some $R \ge 1$ such that

$$\sup_{\varepsilon\in(0,1]} \|c_{0,\varepsilon} - c_A|_{t=0}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \frac{R^2}{4}\varepsilon^{2N+1}. \tag{5.4}$$

In the following let c_A be as in Theorem 1.3 with R as determined before. We consider the validity of

$$\sup_{0\le t\le\tau} \|c_\varepsilon(t) - c_A(t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla(c_\varepsilon - c_A)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,\tau)\setminus\Gamma(\delta))} \le \frac{R^2}{2}\varepsilon^{2N+1}, \tag{5.5a}$$

$$\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}(c_\varepsilon - c_A)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,\tau)\cap\Gamma(2\delta))} + \varepsilon^2\|\partial_{\mathbf{n}}(c_\varepsilon - c_A)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,\tau)\cap\Gamma(2\delta))} \le \frac{R^2}{2}\varepsilon^{2N+1} \tag{5.5b}$$

for some $\tau = \tau(\varepsilon) \in (0, T_0]$ and all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ for sufficiently small $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1)$, which imply (1.21) for $T = \tau$. Since the statement of Theorem 1.1 is for sufficiently short time and small ε, we can assume that $\tau \le T_1$ and $\varepsilon_0 \le \varepsilon_1$, where T_1, ε_1 are as in Lemma 4.8. Hence (3.4) and (4.32) hold true as well. In the following we will prove that (5.5) remain valid as long as $\tau < T$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ for some $T \in (0, T_0]$ independent of ε and some sufficiently small $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1)$.

Now we define

$$T_\varepsilon := \sup\{\tau \in [0, T_0] : (5.5) \text{ holds true.}\}.$$

Because of (5.4), since c_ε, c_A are smooth, and since $\|c_\varepsilon(t) - c_A(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ is continuous in $t \in [0, T_0]$, we have $T_\varepsilon > 0$. It remains to show that T_ε has a positive lower bound that is independent of ε. To this end, we apply Theorem 1.3 and obtain

$$\partial_t c_A + (\mathbf{v}_A + \varepsilon^2\mathbf{w}_2)\cdot\nabla c_A + \varepsilon^2\mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma\cdot\nabla c_A - \Delta c_A + \varepsilon^{-2}f'(c_A) = r_A \tag{5.6}$$

where $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{v}_A + \varepsilon^2(\mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbf{w}_2)$ and

$$\int_0^T \left|\int_\Omega r_A(x,t)(c_\varepsilon(x,t) - c_A(x,t))\mathrm{d}x\right| \mathrm{d}t \le M_R(\varepsilon, T)\varepsilon^{2N+1} \tag{5.7}$$

for all $T \in (0, T_\varepsilon]$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$, where $M_R(\varepsilon, T) \to_{(\varepsilon,T)\to 0} 0$. For the following let $u = c_\varepsilon - c_A$ and $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon = -\Delta + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}f''(c_A)$. Then we have

$$\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon\cdot\nabla c_\varepsilon - (\mathbf{v}_A + \varepsilon^2\mathbf{w}_2)\cdot\nabla c_A = \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon\cdot\nabla u + \varepsilon^2\mathbf{w}_1\cdot\nabla c_A.$$

Subtracting (5.6) from (1.7) and substituting the latter formula leads to

$$\partial_t u + \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon\cdot\nabla u + \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon u = -r_\varepsilon(c_\varepsilon, c_A) - r_A + \mathcal{R} \tag{5.8}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon$ is as in (1.24) and

$$\begin{aligned} r_\varepsilon(c_\varepsilon, c_A) &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\left(f'(c_\varepsilon) - f'(c_A) - f''(c_A)(c_\varepsilon - c_A)\right), \\ \mathcal{R} &= -\varepsilon^2\mathbf{w}_1\cdot\nabla c_A + \varepsilon^2\mathbf{w}_1|_\Gamma\cdot\nabla c_A. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the inner product of (5.8) with u in $L^2(\Omega)$ yields

$$\frac{1}{2}\|u(t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \int_0^t \int_\Omega \left(|\nabla u|^2 + \frac{f''(c_A)}{\varepsilon^2} u^2 \right) \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s \tag{5.9}$$
$$\leq \int_0^t \int_\Omega |r_\varepsilon(c_\varepsilon, c_A) u| \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t \left| \int_\Omega r_A \, u \mathrm{d}x \right| \mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t \left| \int_\Omega \mathcal{R} \, u \mathrm{d}x \right| \mathrm{d}s + \frac{1}{2}\|u(0)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

for all $t \in [0, T_\varepsilon]$. Now using Theorem 2.13, (5.4), and (5.7) we obtain

$$\sup_{0\leq s\leq t} \|u(s,\cdot)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,t)\cap\Gamma(2\delta))} + \|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,t)\setminus\Gamma(\delta))}$$
$$\leq C \int_0^t \|u(s,\cdot)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t \int_\Omega |r_\varepsilon(c_\varepsilon, c_A) u| \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t \left| \int_\Omega \mathcal{R} \, u \mathrm{d}x \right| \mathrm{d}s$$
$$+ \left(\frac{R^2}{4} + M_R(\varepsilon, t) \right) \varepsilon^{2N+1} \tag{5.10}$$

for all $t \in [0, T_\varepsilon]$. Here we used that $\|\nabla_\tau u\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(2\delta))} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega\setminus\Gamma_t(\delta))}$ is equivalent to $\|\nabla_\tau u\|_{L^2(\Gamma_t(\delta))} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega\setminus\Gamma_t(\delta))}$. So we can apply Gronwall's inequality on the interval $[0, T]$ with $T \leq T_\varepsilon$ and Young's inequality to obtain

$$\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} \|u(t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,T)\cap\Gamma(2\delta))} + \|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,T)\setminus\Gamma(\delta))} \tag{5.11}$$
$$\leq e^{CT} \left(\int_0^T \int_\Omega |r_\varepsilon(c_\varepsilon, c_A) u| \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^T \left| \int_\Omega \mathcal{R} \, u \mathrm{d}x \right| \mathrm{d}t + \left(\frac{R^2}{4} + M_R(\varepsilon, T) \right) \varepsilon^{2N+1} \right).$$

By the definition of T_ε, the first two terms on the right-hand side can be estimated using Lemma 5.2 and Lemma 5.3:

$$e^{CT} \left(\int_0^T \int_\Omega |r_\varepsilon(c_\varepsilon, c_A) u| \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^T \left| \int_\Omega \mathcal{R} \, u \mathrm{d}x \right| \mathrm{d}t + \left(\frac{R^2}{4} + M_R(\varepsilon, T) \right) \varepsilon^{2N+1} \right)$$
$$\leq e^{CT} \left(C(R)(T^{1/8} + \varepsilon^{1/4}) \varepsilon^{2N+1} + \left(\frac{R^2}{4} + M_R(\varepsilon, T) \right) \varepsilon^{2N+1} \right) \leq \frac{R^2}{3} \varepsilon^{2N+1} \tag{5.12}$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ provided $T \leq \min(T_1, T_\varepsilon)$ and $T_1 > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1]$ are sufficiently small. This together with (5.11) implies

$$\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} \|u(t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,T)\cap\Gamma(2\delta))} + \|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,T)\setminus(\Gamma(\delta)))} \leq \frac{R^2}{3} \varepsilon^{2N+1} < \frac{R^2}{2} \varepsilon^{2N+1}$$

for all $T \in (0, \min(T_1, T_\varepsilon))$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ if $T_1 \in (0, T_0]$ and ε_0 are sufficiently small. To complete the proof of (5.5) with strict inequality, it remains to estimate $\partial_{\mathbf{n}} u(x,t)$. To this end we use (5.9), $\inf_{s\in\mathbb{R}} f''(s) > -\infty$, (5.12) and the previous estimates:

$$\varepsilon^2 \|\partial_{\mathbf{n}}(c_\varepsilon - c_A)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,T)\cap\Gamma(2\delta)))} \leq \varepsilon^2 \|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))}$$
$$\leq \int_0^T \int_\Omega \left(\varepsilon^2 |\nabla u|^2 + f''(c_A) u^2 \right) \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t - \inf_{s\in\mathbb{R}} f''(s) \int_0^T \int_\Omega u^2 \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t$$
$$\leq \frac{R^2}{3} \varepsilon^{2N+3} + CT \sup_{0\leq t\leq T} \|u(t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}$$
$$\leq \frac{R^2}{3} \varepsilon^{2N+3} + CT \frac{R^2}{2} \varepsilon^{2N+1} < \frac{R^2}{6} \varepsilon^{2N+1}$$

for all $0 < T \leq \min(T_1, T_\varepsilon)$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ provided $T_1 \in (0, T_0]$ and $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1]$ are sufficiently small.

Altogether we obtain (5.5) with $\tau = \min(T_1, T_\varepsilon)$ and strict inequality for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$, provided $T_1 \in (0, T_0]$ and $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1]$ are sufficiently small. Because of the definition of T_ε and since the norms in (5.5) depend continuously on τ, this implies $T_\varepsilon > T_1$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$. Hence the estimate (1.21) of Theorem 1.1 is proved.

Now (1.22) follows directly from Proposition 3.6 and Theorem 3.5 since $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{v}_A = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_A - \mathbf{v}_A + \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1 + \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2$. Finally, $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \sup_{x\in\Omega, t\in[0,T]} |c_A(x,t)| = 1$ follows easily from the construction of c_A as well as (4.13). The last statement on convergence of $\mathbf{v}_A$ follows easily from the constructions. This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

A Appendix

A.1 Formally Matched Asymptotics for Stokes System

The main task of this and the next subsection is to prove the Lemma 3.4. One approach is to plug (3.12) and (3.16) into (3.7) and to verify. However, in order to show the reader how we obtained these formula, we shall first assume some ansatz and see what kind of equations these terms in the expansion should satisfy. To this end we will construct an approximate solution with the inner expansion

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_A^{in}(\rho,x,t) &= \mathbf{v}_0(\rho,x,t) + \varepsilon \mathbf{v}_1(\rho,x,t) + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{v}_2(\rho,x,t), \\ p_A^{in}(\rho,x,t) &= \varepsilon^{-1} p_{-1}(\rho,x,t) + p_0(\rho,x,t) + \varepsilon p_1(\rho,x,t), \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

where we assume that $(\mathbf{v}_j, p_j)$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_j(\rho,x,t) &= \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_j(\rho,x,t) + d_\Gamma(x,t)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_j(x,t)\eta(\rho), \quad 0 \le j \le 2, \\ p_j(\rho,x,t) &= \tilde{p}_j(\rho,x,t) + d_\Gamma(x,t)\hat{p}_j(x,t)\eta(\rho), \quad -1 \le j \le 1. \end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

where $\eta(\rho)$ satisfies (3.11). Moreover, we assume that (3.19) holds, which implies the matching conditions

$$\lim_{\rho\to\pm\infty} \mathbf{v}_j(\rho,x,t) = \mathbf{v}_j^{\pm}(x,t), \lim_{\rho\to\pm\infty} \partial_\rho \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_j(\rho,x,t) = \lim_{\rho\to\pm\infty} \partial_\rho \mathbf{v}_j(\rho,x,t) = 0, \quad 0 \le j \le 2 \tag{A.3}$$

$$\lim_{\rho\to\pm\infty} p_j(\rho,x,t) = p_j^{\pm}(x,t), \lim_{\rho\to\pm\infty} \partial_\rho \tilde{p}_j(\rho,x,t) = \lim_{\rho\to\pm\infty} \partial_\rho p_j(\rho,x,t) = 0, \quad -1 \le j \le 1. \tag{A.4}$$

for all $(x,t) \in \Gamma(3\delta)$. For the preceding analysis it will be sufficient to solve the first equation in (3.1) up to order $O(\varepsilon)$ and the divergence equation up to order $O(\varepsilon^2)$. This leads to the outer expansion to satisfy $p_{-1}^{\pm}$ being constant and

$$-\Delta \mathbf{v}_j^{\pm} + \nabla p_j^{\pm} = 0, \quad \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_j^{\pm} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega^{\pm}(t) \text{ for } j = 0, 1. \tag{A.5}$$

After determining $\mathbf{v}_j^{\pm}$, they are extended smoothly from $\Omega^{\pm}(t)$ to Ω such that $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_j^{\pm} = 0$ is preserved. The existence of such an extension can be seen as in the discussion before (3.8).

The general routine is: By matching terms with the same powers of ε of the divergence equation, we get $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{k,\mathbf{n}}$ and take the normal component in the Stokes equation to get $\tilde{p}_{k-1}$ and finally use this to solve the Stokes equation to get $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k$.

A.1.1 Divergence equation for $\mathbf{v}_0$:

In the following we will use:

Lemma A.1 *Let $k = 0, 1$. If $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k$ is independent of ρ, then the following formula holds*

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k = \tfrac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{v}_k^+ + \mathbf{v}_k^-\right) \text{ on } \Gamma(3\delta), \quad \hat{\mathbf{v}}_k = \tfrac{1}{2d_\Gamma}\left(\mathbf{v}_k^+ - \mathbf{v}_k^-\right) \text{ on } \Gamma(3\delta) \setminus \Gamma.$$

Moreover, if $\mathbf{v}_k^{\pm} \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ and $\mathbf{v}_k^+ = \mathbf{v}_k^-$ on Γ, then we can define

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}}_k := \tfrac{1}{2}\partial_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{v}_k^+ - \mathbf{v}_k^-) \quad \text{on } \Gamma_t$$

and $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_k \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$. The same statements also hold for the normal and tangential components of $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_k$.

Proof: To prove the first part, since $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k(\rho,x,t)$ is independent of ρ, we take $\rho \to \pm\infty$ in the first equation of (A.2) and use (A.3) to conclude

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k(\rho,x,t) \pm d_\Gamma(x,t)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_k(x,t) = \mathbf{v}_k^{\pm}(x,t) \quad \text{for all } (x,t) \in \Gamma(3\delta).$$

Solving the linear equations leads to the first statement. The proof of the last statement follows from a Taylor expansion with respect to d_Γ as described in the end of Subsection 2.1. ∎

Moreover, we have for $j = 0, 1, 2$

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{div}\Big(\mathbf{v}_j(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon, x, t)\Big) &= \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\partial_\rho \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{j,\mathbf{n}}(\rho, x, t) - \nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon(d_\Gamma, s, t)\cdot\partial_\rho\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{j,\boldsymbol{\tau}}(\rho, x, t)\\ &+ \tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}\eta'(\rho)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{j,\mathbf{n}}(x,t) - d_\Gamma\eta'(\rho)\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon(d_\Gamma, s, t)\cdot\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{j,\boldsymbol{\tau}}(x,t) + \operatorname{div}_x\left(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_j(\rho,x,t) + \hat{\mathbf{v}}_j(x,t)d_\Gamma\eta(\rho)\right)\end{aligned}$$

Therefore it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{div}\Big(\mathbf{v}_A^{in}(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon, x, t)\Big) &= \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\partial_\rho\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}(\rho,x,t)\\ &- \nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon\cdot\partial_\rho\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\boldsymbol{\tau}}(\rho,x,t) + (\rho + h_\varepsilon)\eta'(\rho)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}(x,t)\\ &- d_\Gamma\eta'(\rho)\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon\cdot\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\boldsymbol{\tau}}(x,t) + \operatorname{div}_x\left(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_0(\rho,x,t) + \hat{\mathbf{v}}_0(x,t)d_\Gamma\eta(\rho)\right) + \partial_\rho\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\mathbf{n}}(\rho,x,t)\\ &- \varepsilon\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon\cdot\partial_\rho\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\boldsymbol{\tau}}(\rho,x,t) + \varepsilon(\rho+h_\varepsilon)\eta'(\rho)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\mathbf{n}}(x,t) - \varepsilon d_\Gamma\eta'(\rho)\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon\cdot\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\boldsymbol{\tau}}(x,t)\\ &+ \varepsilon\operatorname{div}_x\left(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1(\rho,x,t) + \hat{\mathbf{v}}_1(x,t)d_\Gamma\eta(\rho)\right) + \varepsilon\partial_\rho\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}}(\rho,x,t)\\ &- \varepsilon^2\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon\cdot\partial_\rho\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}}(\rho,x,t) + \varepsilon^2(\rho+h_\varepsilon)\eta'(\rho)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}}(x,t)\\ &- \varepsilon^2 d_\Gamma\eta'(\rho)\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon\cdot\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}}(x,t) + \varepsilon^2\operatorname{div}_x\left(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_2(\rho,x,t) + \hat{\mathbf{v}}_2(x,t)d_\Gamma\eta(\rho)\right).\end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

Hence equating terms with the same power of ε in the expansion of $\operatorname{div}\mathbf{v}_A^{in}$, we obtain at order $O(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ that

$$\partial_\rho\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}(\rho,x,t) = 0 \qquad \text{for all } \rho\in\mathbb{R}, (x,t)\in\Gamma(3\delta) \tag{A.7}$$

and this together with Lemma A.1 implies

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}} = \tfrac{1}{2}(\mathbf{v}^+_{0,\mathbf{n}}(x,t) + \mathbf{v}^-_{0,\mathbf{n}}(x,t)) \text{ in } \Gamma(3\delta),\ \hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}} = \tfrac{1}{2d_\Gamma}(\mathbf{v}^+_{0,\mathbf{n}}(x,t) - \mathbf{v}^-_{0,\mathbf{n}}(x,t)) \text{ in } \Gamma(3\delta)\backslash\Gamma, \tag{A.8}$$

where $\mathbf{v}_0^\pm$ are extended smoothly from $\Omega^\pm(t)$ to Ω such that $\operatorname{div}\mathbf{v}_0^\pm = 0$ is preserved. So we can define:

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}} = \tfrac{1}{2}\partial_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{v}^+_{0,\mathbf{n}} - \mathbf{v}^-_{0,\mathbf{n}}) \text{ on } \Gamma.$$

For the expansion of the Stokes system, we obtain:

Lemma A.2 *If we relate* $\rho = \frac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_1 - \varepsilon h_2$ *in* (A.1)*, then expanding*

$$-\Delta\mathbf{v}_A^{in} + \nabla p_A^{in} \quad \textit{and} \quad -\varepsilon\operatorname{div}(\nabla c_0^{in}\otimes\nabla c_0^{in}) \tag{A.9}$$

and equating the terms with the same power of ε *yields:*

$$O(\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon^2}) : -\partial_\rho^2\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_0 + \partial_\rho\tilde{p}_{-1}\mathbf{n} = -\partial_\rho((\theta_0'(\rho))^2)\mathbf{n} \tag{A.10}$$

and, if $\partial_\rho\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_0 = \nabla_x\tilde{p}_{-1} = 0$ *and* $\hat{p}_{-1} = 0$*,*

$$\begin{aligned}O(\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}) : &-\partial_\rho^2\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1 - \nabla^\Gamma h_1\partial_\rho\tilde{p}_{-1} + \mathbf{n}\partial_\rho\tilde{p}_0 - (\rho+h_1)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0\eta''(\rho) - 2\eta'(\rho)\partial_{\mathbf{n}}(d_\Gamma\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0)\\ &= \partial_\rho(\theta_0'(\rho))^2\nabla^\Gamma h_1 - (\theta_0'(\rho))^2\mathbf{n}\Delta d_\Gamma.\end{aligned} \tag{A.11}$$

If additionally $\partial_\rho \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1 = 0$ *and* $(\partial_\rho \tilde{p}_1, \partial_\rho \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_2, \partial_\rho^2 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_2) \in \mathcal{R}_{0,\alpha}$, *then*

$$
\begin{aligned}
O(1): &-\partial_\rho^2 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_2 - \eta''(\rho)(h_2\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0 + (\rho+h_1)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1) + \eta'(\rho)\hat{p}_0\mathbf{n}(\rho+h_1) + \mathbf{n}\partial_\rho\tilde{p}_1 - \partial_\rho\tilde{p}_0\nabla^\Gamma h_1 \\
&- \partial_\rho\tilde{p}_{-1}\nabla^\Gamma h_2 + \eta(\rho)\left(\nabla_x(d_\Gamma\hat{p}_0) - \Delta_x(d_\Gamma\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0)\right) - \Delta_x\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_0 + \nabla_x\tilde{p}_0 + 2\eta'(\rho)\nabla^\Gamma h_1\cdot\nabla_x(d_\Gamma\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0) \\
&- 2\eta'(\rho)\partial_{\mathbf{n}}(d_\Gamma\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1) - (\eta'(\rho)h_1\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0 + \eta'(\rho)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0\rho)\Delta_x d_\Gamma \\
&= \partial_\rho(\theta_0'(\rho))^2\nabla^\Gamma h_2 - \partial_\rho(\theta_0'(\rho))^2|\nabla^\Gamma h_1|^2\mathbf{n} + (\theta_0'(\rho))^2\left(\Delta_x d_\Gamma\nabla^\Gamma h_1 + \Delta^\Gamma h_1\mathbf{n}\right), \qquad \text{(A.12)} \\
O(\varepsilon): &-\eta''(\rho)(\rho\hat{\mathbf{v}}_2 + h_1\hat{\mathbf{v}}_2 + h_2\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1) + \eta'(\rho)\mathbf{n}(h_2\hat{p}_0 + h_1\hat{p}_1 + \rho\hat{p}_1) - \eta'(\rho)\nabla^\Gamma h_1(\rho+h_1)\hat{p}_0 \\
&- \partial_\rho\tilde{p}_1\nabla^\Gamma h_1 - \eta''(\rho)(\rho+h_1)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0|\nabla^\Gamma h_1|^2 - \partial_\rho\tilde{p}_0\nabla^\Gamma h_2 + \eta'(\rho)(\rho+h_1)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0\Delta^\Gamma h_1 + \eta(\rho)\nabla_x(d_\Gamma\hat{p}_1) \\
&+ 2\eta'(\rho)\nabla^\Gamma h_2\cdot\nabla_x(d_\Gamma\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0) + 2\eta'(\rho)\nabla^\Gamma h_1\cdot\nabla_x(d_\Gamma\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1) - 2\eta'(\rho)\partial_{\mathbf{n}}(d_\Gamma\hat{\mathbf{v}}_2) - 2\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\partial_\rho\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_2 + \mathbf{n}\partial_\rho\tilde{p}_2 \\
&+ \nabla_x\tilde{p}_1 - \eta'(\rho)(h_1\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1 + h_2\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0)\Delta_x d_\Gamma - \partial_\rho\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_2\Delta_x d_\Gamma - \eta'(\rho)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1\rho\Delta_x d_\Gamma - \eta(\rho)\Delta_x(d_\Gamma\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1) - \Delta_x\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1 \\
&= \left(|\nabla^\Gamma h_1|^2\nabla^\Gamma h_1 - 2(\nabla^\Gamma h_1\cdot\nabla^\Gamma h_2)\mathbf{n}\right)\partial_\rho(\theta'(\rho))^2 \\
&\quad + (\theta'(\rho))^2\left(\Delta^\Gamma h_2\mathbf{n} - \Delta^\Gamma h_1\nabla^\Gamma h_1 + \Delta_x d_\Gamma\nabla^\Gamma h_2 - \tfrac{1}{2}\nabla^\Gamma|\nabla^\Gamma h_1|^2\right) \qquad \text{(A.13)} \\
O(\varepsilon^2): &\sum_{0\le i'\le 2; 0\le i,j,j'\le 1} R_\varepsilon^{i'j'ij}(x,t)(\partial_s^{j'}h_2)^i(\partial_s^{i'}h_2)^j \\
&+ \sum_{0\le i,j,k,i',j',k'\le 1} \tilde{R}_\varepsilon^{i'j'k'ijk}(x,t)(\partial_s^{j'}h_2)^i(\partial_s^{i'}h_2)^j(\partial_s^{k'}h_2)^k \qquad \text{(A.14)}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $R_\varepsilon^{i'j'ij}, \tilde{R}_\varepsilon^{i'j'k'ijk}$ *are uniformly bounded with respect to* $\varepsilon \in (0,1], (x,t) \in \Gamma(3\delta)$.

Proof: Since $c_0^{in} := \theta_0(\rho)$, it follows from (2.17) that:

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\varepsilon\,\mathrm{div}\left(\nabla\theta_0(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon)\otimes\nabla\theta_0(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon)\right) &= -\varepsilon\Delta\theta_0(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon)\nabla\theta_0(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon) - \tfrac{\varepsilon}{2}\nabla|\nabla\theta_0(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon)|^2 \\
&= -\left(\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\theta_0''(\rho) + \theta_0''(\rho)|\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon|^2 + \theta_0'(\rho)\tfrac{\Delta d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - \theta_0'(\rho)\Delta^\Gamma h_\varepsilon\right)\left(\mathbf{n} - \varepsilon\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon\right)\theta_0'(\rho) \\
&\quad - \tfrac{\varepsilon}{2}\nabla\left(\left(\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon^2} + |\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon|^2\right)(\theta_0'(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon))^2\right) \\
&= -\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\partial_\rho(\theta_0'(\rho))^2\mathbf{n} + \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\partial_\rho(\theta_0'(\rho))^2\nabla^\Gamma h_1 + \partial_\rho(\theta_0'(\rho))^2\nabla^\Gamma h_2 - \partial_\rho(\theta_0'(\rho))^2|\nabla^\Gamma h_1|^2\mathbf{n} \\
&\quad - (\theta_0'(\rho))^2\tfrac{\Delta d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}\mathbf{n} + (\theta_0'(\rho))^2\left(\Delta d_\Gamma\nabla^\Gamma h_1 + \Delta^\Gamma h_1\mathbf{n}\right) \\
&\quad + \varepsilon\left(|\nabla^\Gamma h_1|^2\nabla^\Gamma h_1 - 2(\nabla^\Gamma h_1\cdot\nabla^\Gamma h_2)\mathbf{n}\right)\partial_\rho(\theta_0'(\rho))^2 \\
&\quad + \varepsilon(\theta_0'(\rho))^2\left(\Delta^\Gamma h_2\mathbf{n} - \Delta^\Gamma h_1\nabla^\Gamma h_1 + \Delta d_\Gamma\nabla^\Gamma h_2 - \tfrac{1}{2}\nabla^\Gamma|\nabla^\Gamma h_1|^2\right) \\
&\quad + \varepsilon^2\sum_{i'\le 2; i,j,j'\le 1} R_\varepsilon^{i'j'i,j}(x,t)\left(\partial_s^{j'}h_2\right)^i\left(\partial_s^{i'}h_2\right)^j \\
&\quad + \varepsilon^2\sum_{i,j,k,i',j',k'\le 1} \tilde{R}_\varepsilon^{i'j'k'ijk}(x,t)\left(\partial_s^{j'}h_2\right)^i\left(\partial_s^{i'}h_2\right)^j\left(\partial_s^{k'}h_2\right)^k
\end{aligned}
$$

where $R_\varepsilon^{i'j'ij}, \tilde{R}_\varepsilon^{i'j'k'ijk}$ are uniformly bounded with respect to $\varepsilon \in (0,1], (x,t) \in \Gamma(3\delta)$. On the other hand,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_j &= (\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon^2} + |\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon|^2)\partial_\rho^2\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_j + (\tfrac{\Delta_x d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - \Delta^\Gamma h_\varepsilon)\partial_\rho\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_j \\
&\quad + 2(\tfrac{\mathbf{n}}{\varepsilon} - \nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon)\cdot\nabla_x\partial_\rho\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_j(\rho,x,t) + \Delta_x\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_j, \quad 0\le j\le 2, \\
\nabla\tilde{p}_j &= (\tfrac{\mathbf{n}}{\varepsilon} - \nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon)\partial_\rho\tilde{p}_j + \nabla_x\tilde{p}_j, \quad -1\le j\le 1.
\end{aligned}
$$

Furthermore we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta\left(d_\Gamma\hat{\mathbf{v}}_j(x,t)\eta(\rho)\right) &= d_\Gamma\hat{\mathbf{v}}_j\left((\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon^2} + |\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon|^2)\eta''(\rho) + (\tfrac{\Delta d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - \Delta^\Gamma h_\varepsilon)\eta'(\rho)\right) \\
&\quad + \eta(\rho)\Delta(d_\Gamma\hat{\mathbf{v}}_j) + 2\eta'(\rho)\left(\tfrac{\mathbf{n}}{\varepsilon} - \nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon\right)\cdot\nabla_x(d_\Gamma\hat{\mathbf{v}}_j), \\
\nabla\left(d_\Gamma\hat{p}_j(x,t)\eta(\rho)\right) &= \eta(\rho)\nabla_x(d_\Gamma\hat{p}_j) + d_\Gamma\hat{p}_j\left(\tfrac{\mathbf{n}}{\varepsilon} - \nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon\right)\eta'(\rho).
\end{aligned}
$$

If we substitute the above two sets of formulas into (A.9), we get the desired expansion. The last statement (A.14) follows from Lemma 3.3 and the exponential decay of $\theta_0', \theta_0'', \eta', \eta'', \partial_\rho \tilde{p}_1, \partial_\rho \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_2$ and $\partial_\rho^2 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_2$. ∎

A.1.2 Stokes equation for $\mathbf{v}_0$ and p_{-1}:

Taking the normal component of (A.10) and using (A.7) gives $\partial_\rho \tilde{p}_{-1} = -\partial_\rho(\theta_0'(\rho))^2$ and therefore

$$\tilde{p}_{-1}(\rho, x, t) = -\theta_0'(\rho)^2 + \tilde{\tilde{p}}_{-1}(x,t) \text{ for all } (x,t) \in \Gamma(3\delta)$$

for some $\tilde{\tilde{p}}_{-1} \colon \Gamma(3\delta) \to \mathbb{R}$. The matching condition (A.4) implies that

$$p_{-1}^{\pm}(x,t) = 0 + \tilde{\tilde{p}}_{-1}(x,t) \pm d_\Gamma \hat{p}_{-1}(x,t) \qquad \text{if } (x,t) \in \Gamma(3\delta),$$

where $p_{-1}^{\pm}(x,t)$ are constants due to the outer expansion, which can be chosen to be 0 for simplicity. Hence we obtain $\hat{p}_{-1} \equiv \tilde{\tilde{p}}_{-1} \equiv 0$. As a result

$$\tilde{p}_{-1}(\rho, x, t) = p_{-1}(\rho, x, t) = -\theta_0'(\rho)^2, \ \hat{p}_{-1} = 0 \quad \text{for all } (x,t) \in \Gamma(3\delta). \tag{A.15}$$

Now we go back to (A.10) and deduce that $-\partial_\rho^2 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_0 = 0$ and this implies

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_0(\rho, x, t) = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_0(x,t) \qquad \text{for all } (x,t) \in \Gamma(3\delta) \tag{A.16}$$

since the only bounded solution of $-\partial_\rho^2 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_0 = 0$ is independent of ρ. This together with Lemma A.1 yields

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_0 = \tfrac{1}{2}(\mathbf{v}_0^+ + \mathbf{v}_0^-) \text{ on } \Gamma(3\delta), \quad \hat{\mathbf{v}}_0 = \tfrac{1}{2d_\Gamma}(\mathbf{v}_0^+ - \mathbf{v}_0^-) \text{ on } \Gamma(3\delta) \setminus \Gamma \tag{A.17}$$

and

$$\mathbf{v}_0(\rho, x, t) = \tfrac{1}{2}(\mathbf{v}_0^+(x,t) + \mathbf{v}_0^-(x,t)) + \tfrac{\eta(\rho)}{2}(\mathbf{v}_0^+(x,t) - \mathbf{v}_0^-(x,t)), \ \forall (x,t) \in \Gamma(3\delta)\backslash\Gamma, \rho \in \mathbb{R}.$$

On the interface Γ the matching condition yields

$$\lim_{\rho \to \pm\infty} \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_0(\rho, x, t) = \lim_{\rho \to \pm\infty} \mathbf{v}_0(\rho, x, t) = \mathbf{v}_0^{\pm}(x,t) \quad \text{for all } (x,t) \in \Gamma.$$

Hence we have

$$[\mathbf{v}_0^{\pm}](x,t) := \mathbf{v}_0^+(x,t) - \mathbf{v}_0^-(x,t) = 0, \quad \text{for all } (x,t) \in \Gamma \tag{A.18}$$

and it follows from Lemma A.1 that

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0 = \tfrac{1}{2}\partial_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{v}_0^+ - \mathbf{v}_0^-) \text{ on } \Gamma. \tag{A.19}$$

A.1.3 Divergence equation for $\mathbf{v}_1$:

Using (A.16) and (A.6), we obtain at order $O(1)$ of the expansion for $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_A^{in}$ that:

$$\begin{aligned} &(\rho + h_1)\eta'(\rho)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}(x,t) - d_\Gamma \eta'(\rho)\nabla^\Gamma h_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\boldsymbol{\tau}}(x,t) \\ &+ \operatorname{div}_x\left(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_0(\rho,x,t) + \hat{\mathbf{v}}_0(x,t) d_\Gamma \eta(\rho)\right) + \partial_\rho \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\mathbf{n}}(\rho,x,t) = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{A.20}$$

By restricting (A.20) on Γ we can show that $\partial_\rho \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\mathbf{n}}(\rho,x,t) = 0$, which implies

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\mathbf{n}}(\rho,x,t) = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\mathbf{n}}(x,t) \quad \text{on } \Gamma, \tag{A.21}$$

by showing that

$$(\rho + h_1)\eta'(\rho)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}(x,t) + \operatorname{div}_x\left(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_0(x,t) + \hat{\mathbf{v}}_0(x,t) d_\Gamma \eta(\rho)\right) = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma.$$

Actually, it follows from (A.19), (A.18) and $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_0^{\pm} = 0$ that

$$2\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}} = \partial_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{v}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^{+} - \mathbf{v}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^{-}) = \operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}[\mathbf{v}_{0,\boldsymbol{\tau}}^{\pm}] = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma \tag{A.22}$$

and from (A.17) that

$$\operatorname{div}_x \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_0(x,t) = \tfrac{1}{2}(\operatorname{div}_x \mathbf{v}_0^{+} + \operatorname{div}_x \mathbf{v}_0^{-}) = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma.$$

Hence it follows from (A.21) and (A.3) that $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\mathbf{n}}(x,t) = \mathbf{v}_{1,\mathbf{n}}^{\pm}(x,t)$ and therefore

$$[\mathbf{v}_{1,\mathbf{n}}^{\pm}] := \mathbf{v}_{1,\mathbf{n}}^{+} - \mathbf{v}_{1,\mathbf{n}}^{-} = 0 \qquad \text{on } \Gamma.$$

A similar result holds on $\Gamma(3\delta)\backslash\Gamma$ following from (A.17), (A.5) and the extension process afterwards:

$$\operatorname{div}_x(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_0 + d_\Gamma \hat{\mathbf{v}}_0 \eta(\rho)) = \tfrac{1}{2}\operatorname{div}_x(\mathbf{v}_0^{+} + \mathbf{v}_0^{-}) + \tfrac{1}{2}\eta(\rho)\operatorname{div}_x\left(\mathbf{v}_0^{+} - \mathbf{v}_0^{-}\right) = 0.$$

Since the first two terms on the left hand side of (A.20) vanish on Γ, we can compensate them in (A.6) by terms with higher powers of ε using $1 = \varepsilon\frac{\rho + h_\varepsilon}{d_\Gamma}$. Therefore we simply solve

$$\partial_\rho \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\mathbf{n}}(\rho, x, t) = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma(3\delta)\backslash\Gamma. \tag{A.23}$$

Thus we obtain from Lemma A.1 that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\mathbf{n}} = \tfrac{1}{2}(\mathbf{v}_{1,\mathbf{n}}^{+} + \mathbf{v}_{1,\mathbf{n}}^{-}), \quad \hat{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\mathbf{n}} = \tfrac{1}{2d_\Gamma}(\mathbf{v}_{1,\mathbf{n}}^{+} - \mathbf{v}_{1,\mathbf{n}}^{-}) \quad \text{on } \Gamma(3\delta)\backslash\Gamma \tag{A.24}$$

and the $O(\varepsilon)$ order equation of (A.6) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}&\tfrac{(\rho+h_1)^2}{d_\Gamma}\eta'(\rho)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}} - (\rho+h_1)\eta'(\rho)\nabla^\Gamma h_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\boldsymbol{\tau}} - \nabla^\Gamma h_1 \cdot \partial_\rho \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\boldsymbol{\tau}} + h_2\eta'(\rho)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}} + (\rho+h_1)\eta'(\rho)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\mathbf{n}}\\ &- d_\Gamma\eta'(\rho)\nabla^\Gamma h_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\boldsymbol{\tau}} - d_\Gamma\eta'(\rho)\nabla^\Gamma h_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\boldsymbol{\tau}} + \operatorname{div}_x(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{v}}_1 d_\Gamma\eta(\rho)) + \partial_\rho \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}} = 0.\end{aligned} \tag{A.25}$$

A.1.4 Stokes equation for $\mathbf{v}_1$ and p_0:

We substitute (A.15) and (A.17) into (A.11). This leads to

$$O(\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}) : -\partial_\rho^2 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1 + \mathbf{n}\partial_\rho \tilde{p}_0 - \hat{\mathbf{v}}_0(\rho+h_1)\eta''(\rho) - 2\partial_{\mathbf{n}}(d_\Gamma \hat{\mathbf{v}}_0)\eta'(\rho) = -(\theta_0'(\rho))^2 \mathbf{n}\Delta d_\Gamma \text{ in } \Gamma(3\delta). \tag{A.26}$$

Restricting (A.26) on Γ, integrating with respect to $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$, and using (A.3), (A.4), (A.18) and the last formula in (2.4) imply

$$\mathbf{n}[\tilde{p}_0] - 2\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0 = \sigma H \mathbf{n} \qquad \text{on } \Gamma.$$

To proceed, we need the following lemma

Lemma A.3 *Let $j = 0, 1$. Under the condition that $[\mathbf{v}_j^{\pm}] := \mathbf{v}_j^{+} - \mathbf{v}_j^{-} = 0$ on Γ, it holds that*

$$[p_j^{\pm}] = [\tilde{p}_j], 2\hat{\mathbf{v}}_j = [\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{v}_j^{\pm}] = 2\left(D\mathbf{v}_j^{+} - D\mathbf{v}_j^{-}\right) \quad \text{on } \Gamma.$$

Proof: We shall only prove $[\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{v}_j^{\pm}] = 2\left(D\mathbf{v}_j^{+} - D\mathbf{v}_j^{-}\right)$ since the others are consequences of the matching condition (A.4) and Lemma A.1 (see also (A.38)). On Γ we have

$$\begin{aligned}2(D\mathbf{v}_j^{+} - D\mathbf{v}_j^{-})\mathbf{n} &= \partial_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{v}_j^{+} - \mathbf{v}_j^{-}) - (\nabla\mathbf{n}) \cdot (\mathbf{v}_j^{+} - \mathbf{v}_j^{-}) + \nabla(\mathbf{v}_{j,\mathbf{n}}^{+} - \mathbf{v}_{j,\mathbf{n}}^{-})\\ &= \partial_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{v}_j^{+} - \mathbf{v}_j^{-}) + \mathbf{n}\partial_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{v}_{j,\mathbf{n}}^{+} - \mathbf{v}_{j,\mathbf{n}}^{-}) + \boldsymbol{\tau}\partial_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}(\mathbf{v}_{j,\mathbf{n}}^{+} - \mathbf{v}_{j,\mathbf{n}}^{-})\end{aligned}$$

The last two components vanish due to $[\mathbf{v}_j^{\pm}] = 0$ and $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_j^{\pm} = 0$. ∎

These altogether imply

$$2(D\mathbf{v}_0^{+} - D\mathbf{v}_0^{-})\mathbf{n} - (p_0^{+} - p_0^{-})\mathbf{n} = -\sigma H \mathbf{n} \qquad \text{on } \Gamma. \tag{A.27}$$

This along with formal outer expansion leads to the following first order sharp interface system for $(\mathbf{v}_0^{\pm}, p_0^{\pm})$ which has a solution, which is smooth in $\overline{\Omega^{\pm}(t)}$, as long as Γ_t remains smooth:

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta \mathbf{v}_0^{\pm} + \nabla p_0^{\pm} &= 0 && \text{in } \Omega^{\pm}(t), t \in (0,T_0),\\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_0^{\pm} &= 0 && \text{in } \Omega^{\pm}(t), t \in (0,T_0),\\ [2D\mathbf{v}_0^{\pm} - p_0^{\pm}\mathbf{I}]\mathbf{n} &= -\sigma H \mathbf{n} && \text{on } \Gamma_t, t \in (0,T_0),\\ [\mathbf{v}_0^{\pm}] &= 0 && \text{on } \Gamma_t, t \in (0,T_0),\\ \mathbf{v}_0|_{\partial\Omega} &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0,T_0). \end{aligned}$$

Now we can take the inner product of (A.26) with $\mathbf{n}$ and use the above equations together with (A.22), (A.21), and (A.17) and this implies

$$\partial_\rho \tilde{p}_0 = (\theta_0'(\rho))^2 H \qquad \text{on } \Gamma. \tag{A.28}$$

We integrate the above formula, use the matching condition, and obtain

$$\tilde{p}_0(\rho, x, t) = H \int_{-\infty}^{\rho} (\theta_0'(z))^2 \mathrm{d}z + p_0^-(x,t) \quad \text{ on } \Gamma.$$

Taking $\rho \to +\infty$ in the above formula and combining it with (A.19) and (A.27) leads to

$$2\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0 = \partial_{\mathbf{n}} \mathbf{v}_0^+ - \partial_{\mathbf{n}} \mathbf{v}_0^- = 0,\ p_0^+ - p_0^- = \sigma H \qquad \text{on } \Gamma. \tag{A.29}$$

Using this, (A.16) and (A.28), we deduce from (A.26) that

$$\partial_\rho^2 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1(\rho, x, t) = 0 \qquad \text{on } \Gamma.$$

Hence we can use (A.3) to deduce $\partial_\rho \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1 = 0$ and

$$[\mathbf{v}_1] = \mathbf{v}_1^+ - \mathbf{v}_1^- = 0 \qquad \text{on } \Gamma. \tag{A.30}$$

Due to (A.29), the last two terms on the left hand side of (A.26) vanish on Γ and we omit them and get

$$O(\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon}) : -\partial_\rho^2 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1 + \mathbf{n}\partial_\rho \tilde{p}_0 = -(\theta_0'(\rho))^2 \mathbf{n} \Delta d_\Gamma \text{ in } \Gamma(3\delta) \tag{A.31}$$

but we have to compensate the omitted terms into (A.12) and (A.13). Meanwhile, we use (A.15) and (A.17) to simplify (A.12) into:

$$\begin{aligned} O(1) : &- \partial_\rho^2 \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_2 - \eta''(\rho)(h_2 \hat{\mathbf{v}}_0 + (\rho + h_1)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1) + \eta'(\rho)\hat{p}_0 \mathbf{n}(\rho + h_1) + \mathbf{n}\partial_\rho \tilde{p}_1 - \partial_\rho \tilde{p}_0 \nabla^\Gamma h_1 \\ &+ \eta(\rho)\left(\nabla_x (d_\Gamma \hat{p}_0) - \Delta_x (d_\Gamma \hat{\mathbf{v}}_0)\right) - \Delta_x \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_0 + \nabla_x \tilde{p}_0 + 2\eta'(\rho)\nabla^\Gamma h_1 \cdot \nabla_x (d_\Gamma \hat{\mathbf{v}}_0) \\ &- 2\eta'(\rho)\partial_{\mathbf{n}}(d_\Gamma \hat{\mathbf{v}}_1) - \eta'(\rho)(h_1 \hat{\mathbf{v}}_0 + \hat{\mathbf{v}}_0 \rho)\Delta_x d_\Gamma \\ &\underbrace{- \tfrac{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0}{d_\Gamma} \partial_\rho \left((\rho + h_1)^2 \eta'(\rho)\right) - 2(\rho + h_1)\partial_{\mathbf{n}} \hat{\mathbf{v}}_0 \eta'(\rho)}_{\text{new terms due to compensation}} \\ = &- \partial_\rho (\theta_0'(\rho))^2 |\nabla^\Gamma h_1|^2 \mathbf{n} + (\theta_0'(\rho))^2 \left(\Delta d_\Gamma \nabla^\Gamma h_1 + \Delta^\Gamma h_1 \mathbf{n}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{A.32}$$

while the following terms must be added to (A.13):

$$- \tfrac{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0}{d_\Gamma} h_2 (\rho + h_1)\eta''(\rho) - 2\tfrac{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0}{d_\Gamma} h_2 \eta'(\rho) - 2h_2 \partial_{\mathbf{n}} \hat{\mathbf{v}}_0 \eta'(\rho). \tag{A.33}$$

More precisely, the last two terms on the left-hand side of (A.26) can be treated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &- \hat{\mathbf{v}}_0(\rho + h_1)\eta''(\rho) - 2\partial_{\mathbf{n}}(d_\Gamma \hat{\mathbf{v}}_0)\eta'(\rho) = -\tfrac{\varepsilon(\rho + h_\varepsilon)}{d_\Gamma} \left(\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0(\rho + h_1)\eta''(\rho) + 2\partial_{\mathbf{n}}(d_\Gamma \hat{\mathbf{v}}_0)\eta'(\rho)\right) \\ &= \varepsilon \left(-\tfrac{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0}{d_\Gamma} \partial_\rho \left((\rho + h_1)^2 \eta'(\rho)\right) - 2(\rho + h_1)\partial_{\mathbf{n}} \hat{\mathbf{v}}_0 \eta'(\rho)\right) \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^2 \left(-\tfrac{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0}{d_\Gamma} h_2 (\rho + h_1)\eta''(\rho) - 2\tfrac{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0}{d_\Gamma} h_2 \eta'(\rho) - 2h_2 \partial_{\mathbf{n}} \hat{\mathbf{v}}_0 \eta'(\rho)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Now we take the normal component of (A.31) and employ (A.23). This leads to

$$\partial_\rho \tilde{p}_0 + (\theta_0'(\rho))^2 \Delta d_\Gamma = 0 \tag{A.34}$$

and this together with matching conditions (A.4) implies

$$\hat{p}_0 = \tfrac{1}{2d_\Gamma}\left(p_0^+ - p_0^- + \sigma\Delta d_\Gamma\right), \tilde{p}_0 = \tfrac{1}{2}(p_0^+ + p_0^-) - \tfrac{\sigma}{2}\Delta d_\Gamma\eta(\rho) \text{ in } \Gamma(3\delta)\setminus\Gamma \tag{A.35}$$

where $\sigma = \int_{\mathbb{R}}(\theta_0'(s))^2 \mathrm{d}s$. Here we have used $\frac{\sigma}{2}\partial_\rho\eta(\rho) = \theta_0'(\rho)^2$ by the definition of η. Thus

$$p_0 = \tfrac{1}{2}(p_0^+ + p_0^-) + \tfrac{\eta(\rho)}{2}(p_0^+ - p_0^-). \tag{A.36}$$

So (A.31) reduces to $\partial_\rho^2\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1 = 0$ in $\Gamma(3\delta)$. Since the only bounded solution of this equation is independent of ρ, we can use Lemma A.1 to deduce

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1 = \tfrac{1}{2d_\Gamma}(\mathbf{v}_1^+ - \mathbf{v}_1^-),\ \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1 = \tfrac{1}{2}(\mathbf{v}_1^+ + \mathbf{v}_1^-),\ \mathbf{v}_1 = \tfrac{1}{2}(\mathbf{v}_1^+ + \mathbf{v}_1^-) + \tfrac{\eta(\rho)}{2}(\mathbf{v}_1^+ - \mathbf{v}_1^-). \tag{A.37}$$

This combined with (A.30) implies

$$2\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1 = \partial_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{v}_1^+ - \mathbf{v}_1^-) \quad \text{on } \Gamma. \tag{A.38}$$

A.1.5 Divergence equation for $\mathbf{v}_2$:

Now we consider the order $O(\varepsilon)$ equation for the divergence-free equation (A.25). Restricting (A.25) on Γ and using (A.17), (A.37), (A.22), (A.30) we conclude that

$$\lim_{d_\Gamma\to 0}\tfrac{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}}{d_\Gamma}(\rho+h_1)^2\eta'(\rho) + (\rho+h_1)\eta'(\rho)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\mathbf{n}} + \partial_\rho\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma. \tag{A.39}$$

Note that the second term in the above equation also vanishes due to (A.38), (A.30) and the divergence-free condition of $\mathbf{v}_1^\pm$:

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\mathbf{n}} = \tfrac{1}{2}\partial_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{v}_{1,\mathbf{n}}^+ - \mathbf{v}_{1,\mathbf{n}}^-) = -\tfrac{1}{2}\operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}(\mathbf{v}_{1,\boldsymbol{\tau}}^+ - \mathbf{v}_{1,\boldsymbol{\tau}}^-) = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma. \tag{A.40}$$

Using this in (A.39) and employing (A.22), we obtain

$$\partial_\rho\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}}(\rho,x,t) + (\rho+h_1)^2\eta'(\rho)\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma. \tag{A.41}$$

In order to determine $\mathbf{v}_{2,\mathbf{n}}^\pm$, instead of solving a certain sharp interface system as we did for $(\mathbf{v}_1^\pm, p_1^\pm)$, we choose $\mathbf{v}_{2,\mathbf{n}}^- \equiv 0$ and integrate (A.41):

$$(\mathbf{v}_{2,\mathbf{n}}^+ - \mathbf{v}_{2,\mathbf{n}}^-) + \int_{\mathbb{R}}(\rho+h_1)^2\eta'(\rho)\,\mathrm{d}\rho\,\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma.$$

Altogether, we define

$$\mathbf{v}_{2,\mathbf{n}}^- \equiv 0 \text{ in } \Omega\times[0,T_0], \quad \mathbf{v}_{2,\mathbf{n}}^+ = -\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}(\rho+h_1)^2\eta'(\rho)\mathrm{d}\rho \quad \text{in } \overline{\Gamma(3\delta)} \tag{A.42}$$

and extend $\mathbf{v}_{2,\mathbf{n}}^+$ smoothly to $\Omega\times[0,T_0]$. Note that, in contrast to $\mathbf{v}_1^\pm$, we do not assume $\mathbf{v}_2^+$ to be divergence-free.

In view of (A.29), we can treat (A.25) in $\Gamma(3\delta)$ in the same manner as before by omitting the terms that vanish on the interface and just solve

$$(\rho+h_1)^2\eta'(\rho)\tfrac{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}}{d_\Gamma} + \partial_\rho\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Gamma(3\delta). \tag{A.43}$$

This together with (A.37), (A.17), (A.5) and the extension process after it will change the expansion of the divergence equation (A.6) into

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{div}\left(\mathbf{v}_A^{in}(\tfrac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon} - h_\varepsilon, x, t)\right) = \\
O(\varepsilon):\quad &-(\rho+h_1)\eta'(\rho)\nabla^\Gamma h_1\cdot\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\boldsymbol{\tau}} - d_\Gamma\eta'(\rho)\nabla^\Gamma h_1\cdot\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\boldsymbol{\tau}} + (\rho+h_1)\eta'(\rho)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\mathbf{n}} \\
&+ h_2\eta'(\rho)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}} - d_\Gamma\eta'(\rho)\nabla^\Gamma h_2\cdot\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\boldsymbol{\tau}} \qquad (A.44)\\
O(\varepsilon^2):\quad &+(\rho+h_1)h_2\eta'(\rho)\frac{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}}{d_\Gamma} - h_2\eta'(\rho)\nabla^\Gamma h_1\cdot\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\boldsymbol{\tau}} + h_2\eta'(\rho)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\mathbf{n}} - d_\Gamma\eta'(\rho)\nabla^\Gamma h_2\cdot\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\boldsymbol{\tau}} \\
&-\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon\cdot\partial_\rho\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}} + (\rho+h_\varepsilon)\eta'(\rho)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}}(x,t) - d_\Gamma\eta'(\rho)\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon\cdot\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}}(x,t) \\
&+\operatorname{div}_x\left(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_2(\rho,x,t) + \hat{\mathbf{v}}_2(x,t)d_\Gamma\eta(\rho)\right) \qquad (A.45)
\end{aligned}$$

as remainders terms at the corresponding orders.

The above analysis together with (A.3) allow us to solve $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}}$ uniquely:

Lemma A.4 *The normal component of* $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_2$ *and* $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_2$ *are given by:*

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}} = \mathbf{v}_{2,\mathbf{n}}^- + d_\Gamma \hat{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}} - \frac{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}}{d_\Gamma}\int_{-\infty}^{\rho}(z+h_1)^2\eta'(z)\mathrm{d}z \qquad \text{on } \Gamma(3\delta)\backslash\Gamma,$$
$$\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}} = \frac{1}{2d_\Gamma}\left(\frac{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}}{d_\Gamma}\int_{\mathbb{R}}(z+h_1)^2\eta'(z)\mathrm{d}z + \mathbf{v}_{2,\mathbf{n}}^+ - \mathbf{v}_{2,\mathbf{n}}^-\right) \quad \text{on } \Gamma(3\delta)\backslash\Gamma,$$

where $\mathbf{v}_{2,\mathbf{n}}^{\pm}$ *is given by* (A.42) *and is extended smoothly to* $\Omega\times[0,T_0]$.

A.1.6 Stokes equation for $\mathbf{v}_2$ and p_1:

According to (A.17) and (A.35)

$$\Delta_x\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_0 + \Delta_x(d_\Gamma\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0)\eta(\rho) = \Delta_x\mathbf{v}_0^+\tfrac{1+\eta(\rho)}{2} + \Delta_x\mathbf{v}_0^-\tfrac{1-\eta(\rho)}{2},$$
$$\nabla_x\tilde{p}_0 + \nabla_x(d_\Gamma\hat{p}_0)\eta(\rho) = \nabla_x p_0^+\tfrac{1+\eta(\rho)}{2} + \nabla_x p_0^-\tfrac{1-\eta(\rho)}{2}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}&-\Delta_x\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_0 - \Delta_x(d_\Gamma\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0)\eta(\rho) + \nabla_x\tilde{p}_0 + \nabla_x(d_\Gamma\hat{p}_0)\eta(\rho)\\ &= (-\Delta_x\mathbf{v}_0^+ + \nabla_x p_0^+)\tfrac{1+\eta(\rho)}{2} + (-\Delta_x\mathbf{v}_0^- + \nabla_x p_0^-)\tfrac{1-\eta(\rho)}{2}.\end{aligned}$$

This together with (A.17), (A.34), (A.35), and (A.37) reduces (A.32) to

$$\begin{aligned}O(1):&-\partial_\rho^2\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_2 - \eta''(\rho)(h_2\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0 + (\rho+h_1)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1) + \eta'(\rho)\hat{p}_0\mathbf{n}(\rho+h_1) + \mathbf{n}\partial_\rho\tilde{p}_1\\ &+ (-\Delta_x\mathbf{v}_0^+ + \nabla_x p_0^+)\tfrac{1+\eta(\rho)}{2} + (-\Delta_x\mathbf{v}_0^- + \nabla_x p_0^-)\tfrac{1-\eta(\rho)}{2} + 2\eta'(\rho)\nabla^\Gamma h_1\cdot\nabla_x(d_\Gamma\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0)\\ &- 2\eta'(\rho)\partial_{\mathbf{n}}(d_\Gamma\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1) - (h_1\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0 + \hat{\mathbf{v}}_0\rho)\eta'(\rho)\Delta_x d_\Gamma\\ &- \tfrac{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0}{d_\Gamma}\partial_\rho\left((\rho+h_1)^2\eta'(\rho)\right) - 2(\rho+h_1)\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0\eta'(\rho)\\ &= -\partial_\rho(\theta_0'(\rho))^2|\nabla^\Gamma h_1|^2\mathbf{n} + (\theta_0'(\rho))^2\Delta^\Gamma h_1\mathbf{n}.\end{aligned} \tag{A.46}$$

Restricting (A.46) on Γ and using (A.29) to eliminate the terms containing $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0$ we derive

$$\begin{aligned}&-\partial_\rho^2\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_2 - \eta''(\rho)(\rho+h_1)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1 + \eta'(\rho)(\rho+h_1)\mathbf{n}\hat{p}_0 + \mathbf{n}\partial_\rho\tilde{p}_1 - 2\eta'(\rho)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1 - \partial_{\mathbf{n}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0\partial_\rho\left((\rho+h_1)^2\eta'(\rho)\right)\\ &- 2(\rho+h_1)\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0\eta'(\rho) = -\partial_\rho(\theta_0'(\rho))^2|\nabla_\Gamma h_1|^2\mathbf{n} + (\theta_0'(\rho))^2\Delta_\Gamma h_1\mathbf{n} \quad \text{on } \Gamma\end{aligned} \tag{A.47}$$

at order $O(1)$. Integrating the above identity with respect to $\rho\in\mathbb{R}$ and then using (A.3) and (A.4) yields

$$-2\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1 + \mathbf{n}[\tilde{p}_1] + 2h_1\mathbf{n}\hat{p}_0 - 4h_1\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0 = \sigma\Delta_\Gamma h_1\mathbf{n} \quad \text{on } \Gamma. \tag{A.48}$$

Now Lemma A.3 together with (A.38) and (A.48) implies

$$[2D\mathbf{v}_1^{\pm} - p_1^{\pm}\mathbf{I}]\cdot\mathbf{n} = 2h_1\mathbf{n}\hat{p}_0 - 4h_1\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_0 - \sigma\Delta_\Gamma h_1\mathbf{n} \quad \text{on } \Gamma. \tag{A.49}$$

These together with (A.30) and the outer expansion (A.5) leads to the second order sharp interface limit (3.13).

Now we determine $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}}$ and $\tilde{p}_1$ such that the tangential part of (A.46) is fulfilled on Γ and the normal part is fulfilled on $\Gamma(3\delta)$, up to a high order term in ε. From the normal part of (A.46) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\rho\tilde{p}_1(\rho,x,t) &= \partial_\rho^2\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\mathbf{n}} + \eta''(\rho)(h_2\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}} + (\rho+h_1)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\mathbf{n}}) - \eta'(\rho)\hat{p}_0(\rho+h_1)\\ &- 2\eta'(\rho)\nabla^\Gamma h_1\cdot\nabla_x(d_\Gamma\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}) + 2\eta'(\rho)\partial_{\mathbf{n}}(d_\Gamma\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\mathbf{n}}) + (\rho+h_1)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}\eta'(\rho)\Delta_x d_\Gamma\\ &+ \tfrac{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}}{d_\Gamma}\partial_\rho\left((\rho+h_1)^2\eta'(\rho)\right) + 2(\rho+h_1)\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}\eta'(\rho)\\ &- \partial_\rho(\theta_0'(\rho))^2|\nabla^\Gamma h_1|^2 + (\theta_0'(\rho))^2\Delta^\Gamma h_1 =: a_1(\rho,x,t) \text{ in } \Gamma(3\delta).\end{aligned} \tag{A.50}$$

Note that we omitted the lower order term

$$\left((-\Delta_x\mathbf{v}_0^+ + \nabla_x p_0^+)\tfrac{1+\eta(\rho)}{2} + (-\Delta_x\mathbf{v}_0^- + \nabla_x p_0^-)\tfrac{1-\eta(\rho)}{2}\right)\cdot\mathbf{n}$$

that will be treated in (A.56) below. Furthermore, $\lim_{\rho\to\pm\infty}\tilde{p}_1(\rho,x,t)=p_1^{\pm}(x,t)\mp\hat{p}_1(x,t)$ for $x\in\Omega^{\pm}(t)$ because of (A.4). Hence we define for $(x,t)\in\Gamma(3\delta)$

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{p}_1(\rho,x,t)&=\frac{1}{2}\left(p_1^+(x,t)+p_1^-(x,t)-\int_{\mathbb{R}}a_1(z,x,t)\mathrm{d}z\right)+\int_{-\infty}^{\rho}a_1(z,x,t)\mathrm{d}z,\\ \hat{p}_1(x,t)&=\frac{1}{2d_\Gamma(x,t)}\left(p_1^+(x,t)-p_1^-(x,t)-\int_{\mathbb{R}}a_1(z,x,t)\mathrm{d}z\right)\end{aligned}\tag{A.51}$$

where $p_1^{\pm}$ is determined by (3.13). Restricting (A.50) on the interface and integrating with respect to ρ leads to the following compatibility condition:

$$p_1^+(P_{\Gamma_t}(x),t)-p_1^-(P_{\Gamma_t}(x),t)=\int_{\mathbb{R}}a_1(z,P_{\Gamma_t}(x),t)\mathrm{d}z.\tag{A.52}$$

In the rest part of this subsection, we shall determine $(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}},\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}})$, the tangential part of $(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_2,\hat{\mathbf{v}}_2)$. The tangential part of (A.48) implies $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\boldsymbol{\tau}}=-2h_1\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\boldsymbol{\tau}}$ on Γ and we can employ it to simplify the equation for $\mathbf{v}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}}$ on Γ

$$\begin{aligned}-\partial_\rho^2\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}}&=\eta''(\rho)(\rho+h_1)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\boldsymbol{\tau}}+2\eta'(\rho)\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{1,\boldsymbol{\tau}}+\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\boldsymbol{\tau}}\partial_\rho\left((\rho+h_1)^2\eta'(\rho)\right)+2(\rho+h_1)\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\boldsymbol{\tau}}\eta'(\rho)\\&=\left((\rho^2-h_1^2)\eta''(\rho)+4\rho\eta'(\rho)\right)\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\boldsymbol{\tau}}\text{ on }\Gamma\end{aligned}\tag{A.53}$$

To proceed, let us note that $\xi(z):=\int_{-\infty}^{z}\rho\eta'(\rho)d\rho$ and $\xi'(\rho)$ belongs to $\mathcal{R}_{0,\alpha}$ for some $\alpha>0$. This follows easily from the exponential decay of $\xi'(\rho)=\rho\eta'(\rho)$ and $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\rho\eta'(\rho)\mathrm{d}\rho=0$ since η' is even. Hence we can integrate (A.53) to obtain $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}}$:

$$\partial_\rho\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}}=-\int_{-\infty}^{\rho}\left((z^2-h_1^2)\eta''(z)+4z\eta'(z)\right)\mathrm{d}z\ \partial_{\mathbf{n}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\boldsymbol{\tau}}\quad\text{on }\Gamma.$$

Therefore we define $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}}$ on $\Gamma(3\delta)$ through

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}}(\rho,x,t)=-\partial_{\mathbf{n}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{0,\boldsymbol{\tau}}(\rho,P_{\Gamma_t}(x),t)\int_{-\infty}^{\rho}\int_{-\infty}^{y}\left((z^2-h_1^2)\eta''(z)+4z\eta'(z)\right)\mathrm{d}z\mathrm{d}y\tag{A.54}$$

in $\Gamma(3\delta)$ and

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}}(x,t)\equiv 0,\quad \mathbf{v}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}}^{\pm}(x,t):=\lim_{\rho\to\pm\infty}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}}(\rho,x,t)\quad\text{for all }(x,t)\in\Gamma(3\delta),\rho\in\mathbb{R}.$$

Moreover, we extend $\mathbf{v}_{2,\boldsymbol{\tau}}^{\pm}$ smoothly to $\Omega\times[0,T_0]$. It can be verified that the above definitions are compatible with (A.3) and (A.2).

A.2 Proof of Lemma 3.4

The proof will heavily rely on Lemma 3.2.

Proof of (3.21)**:** It follows from (A.7) that the order $O(\varepsilon^{-1})$ is eliminated from (A.6). Then it follows from (A.23) that the order $O(1)$ is eliminated from (A.6) and change the $O(\varepsilon)$ order terms of (A.6) to be as in (A.44). All $O(\varepsilon)$-terms in (A.44) vanish on Γ and decay exponentially in ρ. Hence it follows from Lemma 3.2 that they will be included in the term $g_\varepsilon\left(\frac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon,x,t\right)$ with $(g_\varepsilon)_{0<\varepsilon<1}\in\mathcal{R}^0_{1,\alpha}$. Moreover, the $O(\varepsilon^2)$ order terms in (A.45) can also be included in a term $\varepsilon^2\tilde{g}_\varepsilon(x,t)$, where $\tilde{g}_\varepsilon(x,t)$ is uniformly bounded with respect to $(x,t)\in\Gamma(3\delta),\varepsilon\in(0,1]$. So we proved (3.21).

Proof of (3.20)**:** The construction (A.15) and (A.17) fulfill (A.10) and thus eliminate the $O(\varepsilon^{-2})$ order terms in the expansion of (A.9). The formula (A.36) and (A.37) balance the $O(\varepsilon^{-1})$ order terms in (A.11) and change the $O(1)$ order terms in (A.12) to be (A.46). It can be verified that, in (A.46), the terms that vanish on Γ, except

$$(-\Delta_x\mathbf{v}_0^+-\nabla_x p_0^+)\tfrac{1+\eta(\rho)}{2}+(-\Delta_x\mathbf{v}_0^--\nabla_x p_0^-)\tfrac{1-\eta(\rho)}{2},\tag{A.55}$$

can be included in $\mathcal{R}^0_{0,\alpha}$ and the rest terms are given in (A.47). According to the construction, Lemma A.4 together with formula (A.51), (A.54) determines $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_2, \tilde{p}_1, \hat{p}_1$.Moreover, they belong to the class $\mathcal{R}^0_{0,\alpha}$ and will be included in r_ε.

Although (A.55) vanishes on Γ according to the outer expansion (A.5), it does not decay in ρ exponentially. To treat it, we replace the factor $\frac{1\pm\eta(\rho)}{2}$ by some smooth $\zeta_N^\pm\colon \mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ such that $|\zeta_N^\pm(\rho)|\le Ce^{-\alpha|\rho|}$ and

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\zeta_N^\pm(\rho)\mathrm{d}\rho=0, \zeta_N^\pm(\rho)=\tfrac{1\pm\eta(\rho)}{2}\quad \text{for all } \rho\lessgtr\pm N.$$

Then for $j=0,1$,

$$(-\Delta_x\mathbf{v}_j^\pm+\nabla_x p_j^\pm)\tfrac{1\pm\eta(\rho)}{2}\Big|_{\rho=\frac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon}=(-\Delta_x\mathbf{v}_j^\pm+\nabla_x p_j^\pm)\zeta_N^\pm(\rho)\Big|_{\rho=\frac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon} \tag{A.56}$$

since $(-\Delta_x\mathbf{v}_j^\pm+\nabla_x p_j^\pm)|_{\Omega^\pm(t)}=0$ and $\frac{d_\Gamma}{\varepsilon}-h_\varepsilon\lessgtr\pm N$ in $\Omega^\mp(t)$ if $N>0$ is chosen large enough. Hence the term in (A.55) equals to

$$\sum_\pm(-\Delta_x\mathbf{v}_j^\pm+\nabla_x p_j^\pm)\zeta_N^\pm(\rho)\in\mathcal{R}^0_{0,\alpha}.$$

Using Lemma A.4 and the previous step, one can verify that the terms in (A.13) as well as those in (A.33) belongs to $\mathcal{R}_{0,\alpha}$ and taking into account their level, we can write them in the general form $(\tilde{r}_\varepsilon)_{0<\varepsilon<1}\in\mathcal{R}_{1,\alpha}$. Finally, the terms $R_\varepsilon^{i'j'ij}$ and $\tilde{R}_\varepsilon^{i'j'k'ijk}$ in (3.22) come from (A.14) by multiplication with ε^2.

A.3 Expansion of the Allen-Cahn Part

We shall consider the inner expansion of c as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}c^{in}(x,t)=\hat{c}^{in}(\rho,s,t)&=\theta_0(\rho)+\varepsilon^2\hat{c}_2(\rho,S(x,t),t)+\varepsilon^3\hat{c}_3(\rho,S(x,t),t)\\&=:c_0^{in}(x,t)+\varepsilon^2c_2^{in}(x,t)+\varepsilon^3c_3^{in}(x,t).\end{aligned} \tag{A.57}$$

where ρ is defined by

$$\rho=\frac{d_{\Gamma_t}(x)}{\varepsilon}-h_1(S(x,t),t)-\varepsilon h_{2,\varepsilon}(S(x,t),t). \tag{A.58}$$

Here and in the following x and (ρ,s) will always be related by (A.58) and $s=S(x,t)$ if both variables appear. Moreover, we will for simplicity write h_2 instead of $h_{2,\varepsilon}$ in the following.

It follows from

$$S(X_0(s,t)+r\mathbf{n}(s,t))=s\qquad\text{for all } s\in\mathbb{T}^1, t\in[0,T_0], r\in(-3\delta,3\delta)$$

that, by differentiating with respect to r,

$$(\nabla S)(x,t)\cdot\mathbf{n}(S(x,t),t)=0\qquad\text{for all } (x,t)\in\Gamma(3\delta).$$

Therefore it follows from (2.8) that

$$\left|\tfrac{\mathbf{n}(s,t)}{\varepsilon}-(\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon)(r,s,t)\right|^2=\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}+|\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon(r,s,t)|^2$$

for all $r\in(-3\delta,3\delta), s=S(x,t)\in\mathbb{T}^1, t\in[0,T_0]$. So we can employ the formula (2.17) and notation (2.1), (2.2) to get

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t c_0^{in}(x,t)&=\theta_0'(\rho)\left(-\tfrac{V(s,t)}{\varepsilon}-\partial_t^\Gamma h_\varepsilon(r,s,t)\right)\\\nabla c_0^{in}(x,t)&=\theta_0'(\rho)\left(\tfrac{\mathbf{n}(s,t)}{\varepsilon}-\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon(r,s,t)\right)\\\Delta c_0^{in}(x,t)&=\theta_0''(\rho)\left(\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon^2}+|\nabla^\Gamma h_\varepsilon(r,s,t)|^2\right)+\theta_0'(\rho)\left(\tfrac{\Delta d_{\Gamma_t}(x)}{\varepsilon}-\Delta^\Gamma h_\varepsilon(r,s,t)\right).\end{aligned} \tag{A.59}$$

Here and in the following all functions as e.g. $\theta_0', \hat{c}_2, h_1, \nabla^\Gamma \hat{c}_2, \nabla^\Gamma h_1$ without arguments are evaluated at $\rho, (\rho, s, t)$, (s, t), (r, ρ, s, t), (r, s, t), respectively. Moreover, Taylor expansion yields

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} f'(c^{in}(x,t)) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} f'(\theta_0(\rho)) + f''(\theta_0(\rho))\hat{c}_2(\rho,s,t) + \varepsilon f''(\theta_0(\rho))\hat{c}_3(\rho,s,t) + \mathfrak{R}_1,$$

where

$$\mathfrak{R}_1 = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} f'''\left(\theta_0(\rho) + \xi(\rho,s,t)(\varepsilon^2\hat{c}_2 + \varepsilon^3\hat{c}_3)(\rho,s,t)\right)\left(\hat{c}_2(\rho,s,t) + \varepsilon\hat{c}_3(\rho,s,t)\right)^2$$

for some $\xi(\rho, s, t) \in [0, 1]$. This together with (A.59) and (2.17) applied to $\hat{c}_2, \hat{c}_3$ leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t c^{in}(x,t) - \Delta c^{in}(x,t) + \varepsilon^2 X_0^*(\mathbf{w}_1)\cdot\nabla c_0^{in}(x,t) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} f'(c^{in}(x,t)) \\
&= \underbrace{\frac{f'(\theta_0) - \theta_0''}{\varepsilon^2}}_{=0} + \frac{-V - \Delta d_\Gamma(x,t)}{\varepsilon}\theta_0' + (\Delta^\Gamma h_1 - \partial_t^\Gamma h_1)\theta_0' - \partial_\rho^2\hat{c}_2 + f''(\theta_0)\hat{c}_2 - |\nabla^\Gamma h_1|^2\theta_0'' \\
&\quad + \varepsilon(\Delta^\Gamma h_2 - \partial_t^\Gamma h_2 + \mathbf{n}\cdot X_0^*(\mathbf{w}_1))\theta_0' - \varepsilon(V + \Delta d_\Gamma(x,t))\partial_\rho\hat{c}_2 - \varepsilon\left(\partial_\rho^2\hat{c}_3 + f''(\theta_0)\hat{c}_3\right) \\
&\quad - 2\varepsilon\nabla^\Gamma h_1\cdot\nabla^\Gamma h_2\theta_0'' + \mathfrak{R}_1 + \sum_{k=2}^5 \varepsilon^k\mathfrak{R}_k + \varepsilon^3(D_t - \Delta_\Gamma)\hat{c}_3.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.60}$$

where $\mathfrak{R}_k$, $k = 2, \dots, 5$, are defined as in the proof of Theorem 4.5.

First we eliminate the terms of order $O(\varepsilon^{-1})$ on the right hand side of (A.60). Because of (2.15) and (1.16), we have

$$V + \Delta d_\Gamma(x,t) - \mathbf{n}\cdot X_0^*(\mathbf{v}) = -\varepsilon(\rho + h_\varepsilon)\kappa_1(s,t) + \varepsilon^2\kappa_2(s,t)(\rho + h_\varepsilon)^2 + \varepsilon^3\kappa_{3,\varepsilon}(\rho,s,t). \tag{A.61}$$

Hence, using Lemma 4.4, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t c^{in}(x,t) + \mathbf{v}_A^{in}(\rho,x,t)\cdot\nabla c^{in}(x,t) + \varepsilon^2 X_0^*(\mathbf{w}_1)\cdot\nabla c_0^{in}(x,t) - \Delta c^{in}(x,t) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} f'(c^{in}(x,t)) \\
&= \theta_0'\Big((\rho + h_1)\kappa_1 + \varepsilon h_2\kappa_1 - \varepsilon\kappa_2(\rho + h_\varepsilon)^2 - \varepsilon^2\kappa_{3,\varepsilon} + \Delta^\Gamma h_1(r,s,t) - \partial_t^\Gamma h_1(r,s,t)\Big) \\
&\quad + \theta_0'\left(X_0^*(\mathbf{v}_{1,\mathbf{n}}^\pm) + X_0^*(\mathbf{v})\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_1 + X_0^*(\mathbf{v})\cdot L^\nabla h_1 - X_0^*(\operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\mathbf{v})(\rho + h_1)\right) \\
&\quad - \partial_\rho^2\hat{c}_2 + f''(\theta_0)\hat{c}_2 \underbrace{-|\nabla_\Gamma h_1|^2\theta_0'' - 2\nabla_\Gamma h_1\cdot L^\nabla h_1\theta_0'' - |L^\nabla h_1|^2\theta_0''}_{=-|\nabla^\Gamma h_1|^2\theta_0'' \text{ due to (2.10)}} \\
&\quad + \varepsilon\big[(\Delta^\Gamma h_2 - \partial_t^\Gamma h_2 + X_0^*(\mathbf{n}\cdot\mathbf{w}_1))\theta_0' - (V + \Delta d_\Gamma(x,t))\partial_\rho\hat{c}_2 - \partial_\rho^2\hat{c}_3 \\
&\qquad + f''(\theta_0)\hat{c}_3 - 2\nabla^\Gamma h_1\cdot\nabla^\Gamma h_2\theta_0'' + (b(\rho,s,t) + X_0^*(\mathbf{v})\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_2 - X_0^*(\operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\mathbf{v})h_2)\,\theta_0'\big] \\
&\quad + \varepsilon X_0^*(\mathbf{v_n})\partial_\rho\hat{c}_2 + R_\varepsilon(\rho,s,t) + \mathfrak{R}_1 + \sum_{k=2}^5 \varepsilon^k\mathfrak{R}_k + \varepsilon^3(D_t - \Delta_\Gamma)\hat{c}_3
\end{aligned} \tag{A.62}$$

where $\mathbf{v}$ solves (1.11) and $R_\varepsilon(\rho, s, t)$ is given in Lemma 4.4. Now, we want to eliminate all terms of order $O(1)$. To this end, we first list all the $O(1)$ terms in the right hand side of (A.62) that are multiplied by θ_0' and employ (2.10):

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{A} :=& (\rho + h_1)\kappa_1 + (\Delta^\Gamma h_1 - \partial_t^\Gamma h_1) + X_0^*(\mathbf{v}_{1,\mathbf{n}}^\pm) + X_0^*(\mathbf{v})\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_1 + X_0^*(\mathbf{v})\cdot L^\nabla h_1 - X_0^*(\operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\mathbf{v})(\rho + h_1) \\
=& \underbrace{h_1\kappa_1 + \Delta_\Gamma h_1 - D_t h_1 + X_0^*(\mathbf{v}_{1,\mathbf{n}}^\pm) + X_0^*(\mathbf{v})\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_1 - X_0^*(\operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\mathbf{v})h_1}_{\text{vanishes according to (A.63) below}} \\
&+ \rho(\kappa_1 - X_0^*(\operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\mathbf{v})) + L^\Delta h_1 - L^t h_1 + X_0^*(\mathbf{v})\cdot L^\nabla h_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the terms in the second last line depend only on (s, t). This motivates us to define h_1 as the solution of the following equation on $\mathbb{T}^1 \times [0, T_0]$:

$$D_t h_1 - X_0^*(\mathbf{v})\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_1 - \Delta_\Gamma h_1 - \kappa_1 h_1 + X_0^*(\operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\mathbf{v})h_1 = X_0^*(\mathbf{v}_{1,\mathbf{n}}^\pm) \tag{A.63}$$

together with the initial condition $h_1|_{t=0} = 0$. This changes (A.62) into

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t c^{in}(x,t) + \mathbf{v}_A^{in}(x,t)\cdot\nabla c^{in}(x,t) + \varepsilon^2 X_0^*\mathbf{w}_1\cdot\nabla c_0^{in}(x,t) - \Delta c^{in}(x,t) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}f'(c^{in})\\
=&\theta_0'\Big(\varepsilon h_2\kappa_1 - \varepsilon\kappa_2(\rho+h_\varepsilon)^2 + \rho(\kappa_1 - X_0^*(\operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\mathbf{v}))\Big)\\
&-\partial_\rho^2\hat c_2 + f''(\theta_0)\hat c_2 - |\nabla_\Gamma h_1|^2\theta_0''\\
&\underbrace{-2\nabla_\Gamma h_1\cdot L^\nabla h_1\theta_0'' - |L^\nabla h_1|^2\theta_0'' + \theta_0'(L^\Delta h_1 - L^t h_1 + X_0^*(\mathbf{v})\cdot L^\nabla h_1)}_{=:\mathfrak{D}_1(d_\Gamma,\rho,s,t)}\\
&+\varepsilon\big[(\Delta^\Gamma h_2(r,s,t) - \partial_t^\Gamma h_2(r,s,t) + X_0^*(\mathbf{n}\cdot\mathbf{w}_1))\theta_0' - (V+\Delta d_\Gamma(x,t))\partial_\rho\hat c_2 - \partial_\rho^2\hat c_3\big]\\
&+\varepsilon\big[f''(\theta_0)\hat c_3 - 2\nabla^\Gamma h_1(r,s,t)\cdot\nabla^\Gamma h_2(r,s,t)\theta_0'' + (b + X_0^*(\mathbf{v})\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_2 - X_0^*(\operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\mathbf{v})h_2)\,\theta_0'\big]\\
&+\varepsilon X_0^*(\mathbf{v_n})\partial_\rho\hat c_2 + R_\varepsilon(x,t) + \mathfrak{R}_1 + \sum_{k=2}^5\varepsilon^k\mathfrak{R}_k + \varepsilon^3(D_t-\Delta_\Gamma)\hat c_3 - \varepsilon^2\kappa_{3,\varepsilon}\theta_0'.
\end{aligned}\tag{A.64}$$

By the definition in (2.10), $L^\Delta h_1, L^\nabla h_1$ and $L^t h_1$ are smooth functions that vanish on Γ. Therefore, using a Taylor expansion with respect to $r = d_\Gamma$ in the coefficients of L^Δ, L^∇, and L^t und using $d_\Gamma = \varepsilon(\rho+h_1) + \varepsilon^2 h_2$ we obtain

$$\mathfrak{D}_1(d_\Gamma,\rho,s,t) = d_\Gamma\mathfrak{D}(\rho,s,t) + d_\Gamma^2\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}(d_\Gamma,\rho,s,t) = \varepsilon(\rho+h_1)\mathfrak{D}(\rho,s,t) + \varepsilon^2\widehat{\mathfrak{D}}_\varepsilon(\rho,s,t),\tag{A.65}$$

where $\mathfrak{D}(\rho,s,t) = \partial_r\mathfrak{D}_1(0,\rho,s,t) \in \mathcal{R}_{0,\alpha}$ is independent of h_2, but $\widehat{\mathfrak{D}}_\varepsilon(\rho,s,t)$ depends on h_2. Moreover, there is some $C(M)>0$ such that

$$|\widehat{\mathfrak{D}}_\varepsilon(\rho,s,t)| \le C(M)e^{-\alpha|\rho|} \qquad \text{for all } (\rho,s,t)\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T_\varepsilon], \varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0]\tag{A.66}$$

provided (3.4) holds true. Hence $\mathfrak{D}_1$ can be rewritten as a term of order $O(\varepsilon)$. In order to eliminate the remaining $O(1)$ terms, we only need to choose $\hat c_2$ such that

$$-\partial_\rho^2\hat c_2 + f''(\theta_0(\rho))\hat c_2 = |\nabla_\Gamma h_1|^2\theta_0''(\rho) - \theta_0'(\rho)\rho(\kappa_1 - X_0^*(\operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\mathbf{v}))$$

for all $(\rho,s,t)\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T_0]$ and the solvability is guaranteed by Proposition 2.3. With this choice and (2.10), (A.64) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t c^{in}(x,t) + \mathbf{v}_A^{in}(\rho,x,t)\cdot\nabla c^{in}(x,t) + \varepsilon^2 X_0^*(\mathbf{w}_1)\cdot\nabla c_0^{in}(x,t) - \Delta c^{in}(x,t) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}f'(c^{in})\\
=&\theta_0'\left(\varepsilon h_2\kappa_1 - \varepsilon\kappa_2(\rho+h_1)^2\right) + \varepsilon(\rho+h_1)\mathfrak{D}\\
&+\varepsilon\big[(\Delta_\Gamma h_2 - D_t h_2 + \mathbf{n}\cdot X_0^*(\mathbf{w}_1))\theta_0' - (V+\Delta d_\Gamma(x,t))\partial_\rho\hat c_2 - \partial_\rho^2\hat c_3 + f''(\theta_0)\hat c_3\big]\\
&-2\varepsilon\nabla_\Gamma h_1\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_2\theta_0'' + \varepsilon\left[\nabla_\Gamma h_2\cdot X_0^*(\mathbf{v}) - X_0^*(\operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\mathbf{v})h_2 + b\right]\theta_0' + \varepsilon\mathbf{n}\cdot X_0^*(\mathbf{v})\partial_\rho\hat c_2\\
&-\varepsilon^2\kappa_2(2(\rho+h_1)h_2 + \varepsilon h_2^2)\theta_0' - 2\varepsilon\left(\nabla_\Gamma h_1\cdot L^\nabla h_2 + L^\Delta h_1\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_2 + L^\nabla h_1\cdot L^\nabla h_2\right)\theta_0''\\
&+\varepsilon^2\widehat{\mathfrak{D}}_\varepsilon + \varepsilon(L^\Delta - L^t)h_2\theta_0' + R_\varepsilon(x,t) + \mathfrak{R}_1 + \sum_{k=2}^5\varepsilon^k\mathfrak{R}_k + \varepsilon^3(D_t-\Delta_\Gamma)\hat c_3 - \varepsilon^2\kappa_{3,\varepsilon}\theta_0'.
\end{aligned}\tag{A.67}$$

Next we start to eliminate the terms of order $O(\varepsilon)$. To this end, we collect all the $O(\varepsilon)$ terms on the right hand side of (A.67) that are multiplied by θ_0' (but not θ_0'') and do not vanish on Γ_t. These terms are included in:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{D}_2 &:= h_2\kappa_1 - \kappa_2(\rho+h_1)^2 + \Delta_\Gamma h_2 - D_t h_2 + X_0^*(\mathbf{n}\cdot\mathbf{w}_1) + X_0^*(\mathbf{v})\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_2 - X_0^*(\operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\mathbf{v})h_2 + b\\
&= \mathfrak{B} + \kappa_1 h_2 - \kappa_2 h_1^2 + \Delta_\Gamma h_2 - D_t h_2 + X_0^*(\mathbf{n}\cdot\mathbf{w}_1) + X_0^*(\mathbf{v})\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_2 - X_0^*(\operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\mathbf{v})h_2\\
&\quad - \mathfrak{B} - \kappa_2(\rho^2 + 2\rho h_1) + b.
\end{aligned}\tag{A.68}$$

Here all terms expect the last two ones depend only on (s,t). Moreover, we added a term $\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{B}(s,t)$ in order to satisfy the compatibility condition for the equation for $\hat c_3$ in the sequel. To eliminate all terms except the last three in (A.68), we choose h_2 as the solution of

$$D_t h_2 - \Delta_\Gamma h_2 - \kappa_1 h_2 - X_0^*(\mathbf{v})\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_2 + X_0^*(\operatorname{div}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\mathbf{v})h_2 = \mathfrak{B} - \kappa_2 h_1^2 + X_0^*(\mathbf{n}\cdot\mathbf{w}_1)\tag{A.69}$$

on $\mathbb{T}^1 \times [0,T_0]$ together with the initial condition $h_2|_{t=0} = 0$. Existence of a solution is proved in Lemma 4.2. Hence (A.68) reduces to $\mathfrak{D}_2 = -\mathfrak{B} - \kappa_2(\rho^2 + 2\rho h_1) + b$ and (A.67) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t c^{in}(x,t) + \mathbf{v}_A^{in}(\rho,x,t)\cdot\nabla c^{in}(x,t) + \varepsilon^2 X_0^*(\mathbf{w}_1)\cdot\nabla c_0^{in}(x,t) - \Delta c^{in}(x,t) + \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon^2} f'(c^{in}) \\
&= \varepsilon(\rho+h_1)\mathfrak{D} + \varepsilon\big[\big(b - \mathfrak{B} - \kappa_2(\rho^2+2\rho h_1)\big)\theta_0' - (V + \Delta d_\Gamma(x,t) - \mathbf{n}\cdot X_0^*(\mathbf{v}))\partial_\rho \hat{c}_2 \\
&\quad + \varepsilon^2 D_t\hat{c}_3 - \varepsilon^2\Delta_\Gamma\hat{c}_3 - \partial_\rho^2\hat{c}_3 + f''(\theta_0)\hat{c}_3 - 2\nabla_\Gamma h_1\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_2\theta_0''\big] \\
&\quad - \varepsilon^2\kappa_2(2(\rho+h_1)h_2 + \varepsilon h_2^2)\theta_0' - \varepsilon^2\kappa_{3,\varepsilon}\theta_0' + \varepsilon^2\widehat{\mathfrak{D}}_\varepsilon + \varepsilon(L^\Delta - L^t)h_2\theta_0' \\
&\quad - 2\varepsilon\Big(\nabla_\Gamma h_1\cdot L^\nabla h_2 + L^\Delta h_1\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_2 + L^\nabla h_1\cdot L^\nabla h_2\Big)\theta_0'' + R_\varepsilon(x,t) + \mathfrak{R}_1 + \sum_{k=2}^5 \varepsilon^k\mathfrak{R}_k. \qquad \text{(A.70)}
\end{aligned}$$

In view of (A.61), we can further rewrite (A.70) as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t c^{in}(x,t) + \mathbf{v}_A^{in}(\rho,x,t)\cdot\nabla c^{in}(x,t) + \varepsilon^2 X_0^*(\mathbf{w}_1)\cdot\nabla c_0^{in}(x,t) - \Delta c^{in}(x,t) + \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon^2} f'(c^{in}) \\
&= \varepsilon(\rho+h_1)\mathfrak{D} + \varepsilon\big[\big(b - \mathfrak{B} - \kappa_2(\rho^2+2\rho h_1)\big)\theta_0' + \varepsilon^2 D_t\hat{c}_3 - \varepsilon^2\Delta_\Gamma\hat{c}_3 - \partial_\rho^2\hat{c}_3 + f''(\theta_0)\hat{c}_3\big] \\
&\quad - 2\varepsilon\nabla_\Gamma h_1\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_2\theta_0'' - \varepsilon^2\kappa_{3,\varepsilon}\theta_0' - \varepsilon^2\kappa_2(2(\rho+h_1)h_2 + \varepsilon h_2^2)\theta_0' + \varepsilon^2\widehat{\mathfrak{D}}_\varepsilon + \varepsilon(L^\Delta - L^t)h_2\theta_0' \\
&\quad - 2\varepsilon\Big(\nabla_\Gamma h_1\cdot L^\nabla h_2 + L^\Delta h_1\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_2 + L^\nabla h_1\cdot L^\nabla h_2\Big)\theta_0'' \\
&\quad + \varepsilon^2\big((\rho+h_\varepsilon)\kappa_1 - \varepsilon\kappa_2(\rho+h_\varepsilon)^2 - \varepsilon^2\kappa_{3,\varepsilon}\big)\partial_\rho\hat{c}_2 + R_\varepsilon(x,t) + \mathfrak{R}_1 + \sum_{k=2}^5\varepsilon^k\mathfrak{R}_k. \qquad \text{(A.71)}
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to eliminate all the $O(\varepsilon)$ terms by solving the following equation for $\hat{c}_3$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon^2 D_t\hat{c}_3 - \varepsilon^2\Delta_\Gamma\hat{c}_3 - \partial_\rho^2\hat{c}_3 + f''(\theta_0)\hat{c}_3 &= 2\nabla_\Gamma h_1\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_2\theta_0'' \\
&\quad - \big(b - \mathfrak{B} - \kappa_2(\rho^2+2\rho h_1)\big)\theta_0' - (\rho+h_1)\mathfrak{D} \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{T}^1\times[0,T_0], \qquad \text{(A.72)}
\end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to (4.11). This is a system treated in Theorem 2.12 and we shall choose $\mathfrak{B}$ such that the compatibility condition of Theorem 2.12 is valid, namely

$$\mathfrak{B}(s,t)\int_{\mathbb{R}}(\theta_0')^2\mathrm{d}\rho = \int_{\mathbb{R}}\big[\theta_0'(b - \kappa_2(s,t)\rho^2) + (\rho+h_1)\mathfrak{D}\big]\theta_0'(\rho)\mathrm{d}\rho \qquad \text{(A.73)}$$

since $\int_{\mathbb{R}}\rho(\theta_0'(\rho))^2\mathrm{d}\rho = 0$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}}\theta_0''(\rho)\theta_0'(\rho)\mathrm{d}\rho = 0$. It is crucial that the right hand side of (A.73), especially $\mathfrak{D}$ defined in (A.65), is uniquely determined by $h_1, \hat{c}_2$ and the solution of (1.11). Hence $\mathfrak{B}$ is is uniquely determined by $h_1, \hat{c}_2$ and the solution of (1.11). So we are able to solve (A.69) and then (A.72) without leading to a circular argument. Finally (A.70) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t c^{in}(x,t) + \mathbf{v}_A^{in}(\rho,x,t)\cdot\nabla c^{in}(x,t) + \varepsilon^2 X_0^*(\mathbf{w}_1)\cdot\nabla c_0^{in}(x,t) - \Delta c^{in}(x,t) + \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon^2} f'(c^{in}) \\
&= R_\varepsilon(x,t) + \sum_{k=2}^5\varepsilon^k\mathfrak{R}_k + \mathfrak{R}_1 - \varepsilon^2\kappa_{3,\varepsilon}\theta_0' - \varepsilon^2\kappa_2(2(\rho+h_1)h_2 + \varepsilon h_2^2)\theta_0' + \varepsilon^2\widehat{\mathfrak{D}}_\varepsilon \\
&\quad + \varepsilon(L^\Delta - L^t)h_2\theta_0' - 2\varepsilon\Big(\nabla_\Gamma h_1\cdot L^\nabla h_2 + L^\Delta h_1\cdot\nabla_\Gamma h_2 + L^\nabla h_1\cdot L^\nabla h_2\Big)\theta_0'' \\
&\quad + \varepsilon^2\big((\rho+h_\varepsilon)\kappa_1 - \varepsilon\kappa_2(\rho+h_\varepsilon)^2 - \varepsilon^2\kappa_{3,\varepsilon}\big)\partial_\rho\hat{c}_2 \\
&= R_\varepsilon(x,t) + \sum_{k=2}^5\varepsilon^k\mathfrak{R}_k + \mathfrak{R}_1 + \mathfrak{R}, \qquad \text{(A.74)}
\end{aligned}$$

which implies (4.20).

References

[1] H. Abels. On generalized solutions of two-phase flows for viscous incompressible fluids. *Interfaces Free Bound.*, 9:31–65, 2007.

[2] H. Abels. On the notion of generalized solutions of two-phase flows for viscous incompressible fluids. *RIMS Kôkyûroku Bessatsu*, B1:1–15, 2007.

[3] H. Abels. On a diffuse interface model for two-phase flows of viscous, incompressible fluids with matched densities. *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.*, 194(2):463–506, 2009.

[4] H. Abels, H. Garcke, and G. Grün. Thermodynamically consistent, frame indifferent diffuse interface models for incompressible two-phase flows with different densities. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 22(3):1150013 (40 pages), 2012.

[5] H. Abels and D. Lengeler. On sharp interface limits for diffuse interface models for two-phase flows. *Interfaces Free Bound.*, 16(3):395–418, 2014.

[6] H. Abels and M. Röger. Existence of weak solutions for a non-classical sharp interface model for a two-phase flow of viscous, incompressible fluids. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 26:2403–2424, 2009.

[7] H. Abels and S. Schaubeck. Nonconvergence of the Capillary Stress Functional for Solutions of the Convective Cahn-Hilliard Equation. In *Mathematical Fluid Dynamics, Present and Future*, Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics. 2016.

[8] H. Abels and M. Wilke. Well-posedness and qualitative behaviour of solutions for a two-phase Navier-Stokes-Mullins-Sekerka system. *Interfaces Free Bound.*, 15(1):39–75, 2013.

[9] N. D. Alikakos, P. W. Bates, and X. Chen. Convergence of the Cahn-Hilliard equation to the Hele-Shaw model. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 128(2):165–205, 1994.

[10] W. Arendt, R. Chill, S. Fornaro, and C. Poupaud. L^p-maximal regularity for non-autonomous evolution equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 237(1):1–26, 2007.

[11] T. Blesgen. A generalization of the Navier-Stokes equations to two-phase flows. *J. Physics D (Appl. Physics)*, 32:1119–1123, 1999.

[12] F. Boyer. Mathematical study of multi-phase flow under shear through order parameter formulation. *Asymptot. Anal.*, 20(2):175–212, 1999.

[13] G. Caginalp and X. Chen. Convergence of the phase field model to its sharp interface limits. *Euro. J. of Applied Mathematics*, 9:417–445, 1998.

[14] E. A. Carlen, M. C. Carvalho, and E. Orlandi. A simple proof of stability of fronts for the Cahn-Hilliard equation. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 224(1):323–340, 2001. Dedicated to Joel L. Lebowitz.

[15] X. Chen. Spectrum for the Allen-Cahn, Cahn-Hilliard, and phase-field equations for generic interfaces. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 19(7-8):1371–1395, 1994.

[16] X. Chen, D. Hilhorst, and E. Logak. Mass conserving Allen-Cahn equation and volume preserving mean curvature flow. *Interfaces Free Bound.*, 12(4):527–549, 2010.

[17] P. De Mottoni and M. Schatzman. Geometrical evolution of devoloped interfaces. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 347(5):1533–1589, 1995.

[18] I. V. Denisova and V. A. Solonnikov. Solvability in Hölder spaces of a model initial-boundary value problem generated by a problem on the motion of two fluids. *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI)*, 188(Kraev. Zadachi Mat. Fiz. i Smezh. Voprosy Teor. Funktsii. 22):5–44, 186, 1991.

[19] G. Dore and A. Venni. On the closedness of the sum of two closed operators. *Math. Z*, 196:189–201, 1987.

[20] J. Escher and J. Seiler. Bounded H_∞-calculus for pseudodifferential operators and applications to the Dirichlet-Neumann operator. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 360(8):3945–3973, 2008.

[21] M. Fei, W. Wang, P. Zhang, and Z. Zhang. Dynamics of the nematic-isotropic sharp interface for the liquid crystal. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 75(4):1700–1724, 2015.

[22] C. G. Gal and M. Grasselli. Asymptotic behavior of a Cahn-Hilliard-Navier-Stokes system in 2D. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 27(1):401–436, 2010.

[23] C. G. Gal and M. Grasselli. Trajectory attractors for binary fluid mixtures in 3d. *Chin. Ann. Math. ser. B*, 31:1–25, 2010.

[24] G. P. Galdi. *An Introduction to the Mathematical Theory of the Navier-Stokes Equations, Volume 1.* Springer, Berlin - Heidelberg - New York, 1994.

[25] Y. Giga and A. Novotny, editors. *Handbook of Mathematical Analysis in Mechanics of Viscous Fluids.* Springer, 2018.

[26] K.-H. Hoffmann and V. N. Starovoitov. Phase transitions of liquid-liquid type with convection. *Adv. Math. Sci. Appl.*, 8(1):185–198, 1998.

[27] K.-H. Hoffmann and V. N. Starovoitov. The Stefan problem with surface tension and convection in Stokes fluid. *Adv. Math. Sci. Appl.*, 8(1):173–183, 1998.

[28] N. J. Kalton and L. Weis. The H^∞-calculus and sums of closed operators. *Math. Ann.*, 321(2):319–345, 2001.

[29] M. Köhne, J. Prüss, and M. Wilke. Qualitative behaviour of solutions for the two-phase Navier-Stokes equations with surface tension. *Math. Ann.*, 356(2):737–792, 2013.

[30] C. Liu, N. Sato, and Y. Tonegawa. Two-phase flow problem coupled with mean curvature flow. *Interfaces Free Bound.*, 14(2):185–203, 2012.

[31] C. Liu and J. Shen. A phase field model for the mixture of two incompressible fluids and its approximation by a Fourier-spectral method. *Phys. D*, 179(3-4):211–228, 2003.

[32] J. Lowengrub and L. Truskinovsky. Quasi-incompressible Cahn-Hilliard fluids and topological transitions. *R. Soc. Lond. Proc. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.*, 454(1978):2617–2654, 1998.

[33] M. Moser. *Lokale Wohlgestelltheit für ein Navier-Stokes/mittleren Krümmungsfluss-System.* Master thesis, Regensburg, 2016.

[34] A. Nouri and F. Poupaud. An existence theorem for the multifluid Navier-Stokes problem. *J. Differential Equations*, 122:71–88, 1995.

[35] P. Plotnikov. Generalized solutions to a free boundary problem of motion of a non-Newtonian fluid. *Sib. Math. J.*, 34(4):704–716, 1993.

[36] J. Prüss, Y. Shibata, S. Shimizu, and G. Simonett. On well-posedness of incompressible two-phase flows with phase transitions: the case of equal densities. *Evol. Equ. Control Theory*, 1(1):171–194, 2012.

[37] J. Prüss and G. Simonett. On the two-phase Navier-Stokes equations with surface tension. *Interfaces Free Bound.*, 12(3):311–345, 2010.

[38] S. Schaubeck. *Sharp interface limits for diffuse interface models.* PhD thesis, University Regensburg, urn:nbn:de:bvb:355-epub-294622, 2014.

[39] Y. Shibata and S. Shimizu. On a resolvent estimate of the interface problem for the Stokes system in a bounded domain. *J. Differential Equations*, 191(2):408–444, 2003.

[40] V. N. Starovoĭtov. A model of the motion of a two-component fluid taking into account capillary forces. *Prikl. Mekh. Tekhn. Fiz.*, 35(6):85–92, 1994.

[41] V. N. Starovoĭtov. On the motion of a two-component fluid in the presence of capillary forces. *Mat. Zametki*, 62(2):293–305, 1997.

[42] E. M. Stein. *Singular Integrals and Differentiability Properties of Functions.* Princeton Hall Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1970.

[43] K. Takasao and Y. Tonegawa. Existence and regularity of mean curvature flow with transport term in higher dimensions. *Math. Ann.*, 364(3-4):857–935, 2016.

(H. Abels) Fakultät für Mathematik, Universität Regensburg, 93040 Regensburg, Germany
E-mail address: helmut.abels@mathematik.uni-regensburg.de

(Y. Liu) NYU-ECNU Institute of Mathematical Sciences at NYU Shanghai, Shanghai, China
E-mail address: yl67@nyu.edu